THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXII, No. 5 MAY, 1955

CONTENTS

The Pastor and His Fallen-Away Catholics. *Bishop Navagh* 289

The Sorrows of Mary. *William R. O'Connor* 297

Evanston and Rome. *John A. Hardon, S.J.* 308

A Note to the Symbolic Death of Christ. *John P. Murphy, S.J.* 328

The Protestant Concept of the Church. *Avery R. Dulles, S.J.* 330

The Necessity of the Church and the Efficacy of Prayer. *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 336

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and Walter J. Schmitz, S.S.

Effects of Sinful Intention on Dispensation. 350

Presumed Father as Godparent. 351

The Blessing after Childbirth. 351

Confirmation by a Substitute Chaplain. 352

Eucharistic Fast Dispensation. 353

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1955, by the Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Previous Page)

Mass on a Ferial Day in Lent 353

Holy Thursday Difficulty 353

Benediction after Holy Mass 354

Forty Hours' Devotion Procession 355

Mass Stipend Obligation 355

Altar Stone 356

BOOK REVIEWS

The Catholic College in the World Today, *by Edward A. Fitzpatrick* 357

The Bishop Finds a Way, *by Michael Cunningham* 358

Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis, *by Petrus Cantor, edited by J. A. Dugauquier* 359

Ordination Gift Suggestion . . .

It is generally recognized that one of the best habits a young priest can form is that of good reading, in line with his calling and the problems and interests of the priesthood.

In view of the forthcoming ordinations throughout the country, what more appropriate and effective way is there of forming this habit than by giving a gift subscription to—

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

We believe that the time to start is during the seminary days. The seminarian who begins his subscription at least the year before ordination is most likely to continue his interest later on.

To stimulate this interest, we are offering a special rate to SEMINARIANS of $3.50 per year, which is less than the actual cost of publication . . . the regular price being $5.00 a year.

Special Rate for Newly Ordained—$4.00

Make out your list and send today to:—

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

620 Michigan Ave., N.E. **Washington 17, D. C.**

THE PASTOR AND HIS FALLEN-AWAY CATHOLICS

There is a tendency in recent articles on leakage from the Church to lump all less-than-perfect-Catholics together, those who are careless, those who are public sinners, and those who have abandoned the Faith, and to class them all as fallen-away Catholics. And then these fallen-aways are written off as lost to the Church with a remark that they have "lost the Faith." Another curious phenomenon is the spectacle in some parishes of a real campaign for converts among the non-Catholic population while a rather large number of weak Catholics who, with little effort, could be brought back to the practice of their religion are completely ignored as beyond hope.

May I note here that what is set down in this article is the result of twenty-five years of experience in the priesthood with men of every national origin, of northern Europeans and Latins, with the so-called natives and with recent immigrants, with city dwellers and inhabitants of small towns and the country-side, with men whose parents and grandparents had lived in the same town and on the same property and migrant workers from south of the Rio Grande and from the islands of the Caribbean Sea. Due to circumstances, I dealt with them not so much in the rectory or about the church property as in their homes, on the streets, in the fields, in those places and circumstances where men are accustomed to gather. And our talk was mostly of the only things necessary—God and the duties of men towards God.

In judging the worth of people as Catholics, we have to judge them by their external behavior, by their fidelity to Masses of obligation, to the sacraments, their obedience to the commandments of God and His Church, their knowledge of the Revelation of Christ especially as they show it in their outward conduct. But it by no means follows that, because a man seldom or never practices his religion, the gift of Faith has departed from his soul.

What is Faith? Faith is a theological virtue that inclines the mind, under the influence of the will and of grace, to yield a firm assent to revealed truth because of the authority of God. The virtue of Faith is infused into the soul at Baptism, but a person having attained the use of reason is obliged to make an act Faith.

The act of divine Faith is a firm assent of the intellect, with the assistance of divine grace, to a truth revealed by God; an assent that is motivated by the authority of God, Who, in revealing, can neither deceive nor be deceived. We recall, too, that habitual Faith is the infused habit of divine Faith. When informed by charity, it is a living Faith; it becomes dead when charity is extinguished, but is not necessarily lost.

Frequently, when I meet men who have ceased the practice of the Catholic religion and who have told me, as an excuse for their folly, "Father, I have lost the Faith," it is my custom to reply, "My dear sir, I am very, very sorry for you indeed—no one loses the Faith. You can throw the Faith away through your own fault, but you can't lose it as you might lose your pocketbook; and anyone who throws away the Faith is, of course, guilty of mortal sin. And since Faith is a gift of God which you can neither earn nor merit, you cannot get it back by your own efforts. You know that, as the Bible says, without Faith it is impossible to please God. So if you no longer have the Faith, you are in sad shape indeed. You are probably damned." It is surprising how quickly such people regain the Faith. Actually, of course, they never lost it.

Anyone who knows the problems of the non-Catholic and the lax or fallen-away Catholic knows that it is much easier and simpler to bring back the straying sheep than to introduce a new one into the Fold of Christ. The bad Catholic at least knows what he should do and why. The non-Catholic with all the good will in the world still does not know exactly what to do or how or why. So the priest who approaches the bad Catholic has much of the way prepared for him.

For the sake of order let us divide these less-than-perfect-Catholics into three groups:

(1) lax Catholics;

(2) those who have incurred excommunication;

(3) those who have either apostatized or joined some heretical sect or who have lapsed into agnosticism.

Among the lax we commonly find:

(1) men who miss Mass occasionally, who seldom receive the sacraments, except at Eastertime, but who, in their lives, give no apparent evidence of evil living;

(2) men who seldom or never hear Mass but do receive the sacraments at Eastertime and who appear to live normally decent lives;

(3) men who occasionally attend Mass but never receive the sacraments, even at Eastertime, yet whose lives are not notoriously evil;

(4) people with shady reputations who occasionally attend Mass;

(5) people who never attend Mass or receive the sacraments, but who, when asked, claim to be Catholics;

(6) people who attend Mass but live in an invalid marriage performed by some judge or who live in concubinage.

Among the excommunicated we find:

(1) those who have attempted marriage before a non-Catholic minister;

(2) those who have given their name to a forbidden society. While these people cannot receive the sacraments, it is true that a number of them attend Mass with more or less regularity and want their children baptized and educated as Catholics.

The true fallen-aways are those who not only no longer practice the Catholic Faith, but who have actually joined a non-Catholic sect or lapsed into agnosticism or become communists.

With regard to the lax Catholics, it would be a grievous error to say that they have lost the Faith and to write them off as lost to the Church. That simply is not true. These people are sinners—sometimes public sinners, but they still have the Faith. With regard to the excommunicated, their Faith has greatly weakened, but in the ordinary persons in this class, although their Faith is a dead Faith, they still have it. With regard to the fallen-aways, it is surprising how many of them have, for reasons of their own, feigned allegiance to an heretical sect or forbidden society while internally they have never rejected the Faith. It is true among this last group will be found those who have no longer the Catholic Faith, but my own experience leads me to believe that in the case of many, while their Faith is almost dead, it is not extinct.

The failure to practice the Catholic religion faithfully is a sin. It takes charity from the soul and reduces a living Faith to dead Faith, but it does not eliminate the habit of Faith. And when there is still Faith in the soul, it is possible to make it live again.

What are the reasons why people fail to practice their religion? The reasons can be put down under two headings:

(1) darkness of the intellect or ignorance;

(2) weakness of the will which flows from original and actual sin.

Many people fail to practice their religion for the simple reason that they have never in their whole lives been properly instructed. For example there are numbers of people of the Spanish stock in our country who certainly fail to practice the Faith, but just as certainly they have the Faith. Their failure is due in the greatest measure to the fact that they never had the opportunity to receive proper instructions in the Revelation of Christ and the commandments of God. And the existence of the Faith in their souls is shown by the tremendous change in their lives once the proper instruction has been given.

With regard to sin, we have only to enumerate the capital sins, pride, covetousness, lust, anger, gluttony, envy and sloth and set them against the divisions above and find infallibly among them the reasons for each of the defections of each class.

What remedies can be proposed to bring these people not back to the Faith, but back to the practice of their Faith? There are three that come to mind immediately.

The first is prayer, public and private, by pastor and people to ask God to reawaken the unfortunate to their sad condition, and to stir them up to bring them back.

The second is instruction, instructions for the young and also instruction for the adults who need it. Many times this instruction can be given in groups. One of the touching experiences of my life is the recollection of the eagerness of adult migrant workers of the Spanish speaking group to study for an hour and a half in the evening, after a hard day's work in the fields, to make up their deficiencies in the knowledge of the Faith. And I recall too, adult groups of other nationalities who willingly came when the occasion was presented in the parish for exactly the same purpose. They all won't come, but many will if they are invited. And if the instruction can't be given in groups, it ought to be given singly. And it ought to be given because of the wonderful fruit that a knowledge of the Revelation of Christ brings forth in the life of a human being.

The third thing that is needed is correction. Correction is usually best given privately. Most correction from the pulpit is wasted for the simple reason that the people who are to be corrected are usually not in the congregation. Correction must be given by the priest as he makes the rounds of his parish. Correction must be given by the priest as he interviews his parishioners when they come to the rectory on various occasions. Corrections must be given by the priest in the confessional as moral theology demands. Correction doesn't mean a scolding; it means to explain patiently what God demands of a Catholic and then to give the reasons why the commands of God should be fulfilled and then urge that God be obeyed. And such correction, if it is given kindly but forcefully by one who loves God and loves souls, is usually fruitful and gradually brings a delinquent to a realization of his error and plants in him a desire to correct himself.

Let me add one other note on remedies. The priest must take a deliberate stand for social and economic justice for all people, very especially his own. And by his own, I mean every soul within the confines of his parish. He must also exercise the greatest charity to all men. But he must not deceive himself into believing that by free entertainment, and games, and recreation, by the distribution of food and clothing and money, he is using the only proper remedies to draw back the lost sheep into the house of Israel. Such things are good and useful and many times prepare the way, but the real remedies are prayer, the instruction that enlightens minds, the correction that strengthens wills; these are the things that bring men back to God.

There are certain principles that should guide us in dealing with lax and fallen-away Catholics.

(1) It is a grave mistake to do nothing for them, to expect that in some way they will by themselves find their way back to the Church. They will not usually unless the priest goes after them.

(2) We ought to underline the fact in our own minds that all people are fundamentally the same. In the new dispensation there is no chosen race, there is no nation or group of people who by their nature are good Catholics, nor conversely is there any group who by their nature are weak Catholics, who have little or no capacity for the Faith. It is prayer and apostolic work, sacrifice and suffering, that not only introduce and nourish the Faith in a

people, but which sustain the Faith. When those things disappear in a group or in an individual, then the Faith weakens and many times dies.

(3) People of weak Faith and even some who have lapsed from the Faith still want their children brought up in the Faith. Hence, they bring them for Baptism, they want them to receive their first Holy Communion, they want them to be confirmed. In the face of this request we can follow three courses.

(a) We can refuse the sacraments to the children and see the parents take them off to some sect which appears to them almost as good. This is the most disastrous course.

(b) We can administer the sacraments as the parents wish us to do. Lax parents are not concerned with necessary preparations such as the instructions and the training of the will which should precede first Holy Communion and Confirmation. Sometimes their attachment to the reception of these sacraments borders on convention, or even superstition. But usually, along with everything else, the Faith they still have impells them to see that their children receive the necessary sacraments. But if the priest, in his desire to win the parents, gives the children a skimpy preparation, he co-operates in raising up a new generation which will be less faithful than the last.

(c) We can give the sacraments according to the mind of the Church. We can take the children and give them an adequate instruction in the Revelation of Christ so that they will love it and live it. And if it takes a long time to do it properly, then we ought to take that time. The instruction imparted and insisted on ought to be conditioned to the age and condition of the child. We should not demand more than the Church does; but we should not be satisfied with less. Then, since the parents will not train the child to pray, to go to Mass regularly, to abstain on Friday, to keep the commandments of God, we must give this training in their place. And if we do not do so, we err grievously, for if we do not do so, it will not be done. If we do so, we will raise up a new generation of fine Catholic men and women. And in the process of so doing we will lead many of the careless parents back to the faithful practice of the Faith.

Some priests fear that strictness drives people from the Church. Discourteousness, scolding, ranting, unreasonableness will drive people from the Church but not the kind, polite but firm insistence

on those things necessary for the salvation of souls. Explain to the parents what you are doing and why you are doing it. The explanation itself affords a wonderful opportunity to remind the parents of their own shortcomings, to urge them to mend their ways.

(4) People infrequently lose the Faith, but frequently they lose their morals. Repair the failings in their moral life and their difficulties of Faith disappear very rapidly.

(5) The Faith dies hard. The Faith is weak in many of these people, but it is still there. In my years in the priesthood of intimate association with vast numbers of people, I can recall hardly five of whom I could honesty say, having once had the Faith, they had lost it.

(6) Constant correction usually has the desired effect. Many will gradually return to the practice of the Faith during their lifetime; most of the remainder will do so at the time of death. It is the experience of every priest who tries it that even when people seem to pay little attention to what their priest has to say they are tremendously impressed by the fact that he takes the time to hunt them up, reprove them and invite them to do better.

(7) The need of correction underlines a necessity of constant home visitation by the priests of the parish and the need of some apostolic group, such as the Legion of Mary, who will assist and substitute for the priest in this work.

(8) The danger of people lapsing from the Church focuses attention on the need of an active parish life which fills the lives of the parishioners seven days of the week. Many Masses and church services, the sacraments easily available each day, instruction for all, young and old, church societies of all kinds, very especially those that look to the apostolate, an active Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, and the constant unending care of children and youth.

(9) Proselytizers are not to be feared where the Church is *free* and *active*. They have nothing to offer in comparison with what the Church offers. They easily become discouraged and fade from the picture wherever the Church has the means to reach out to and care for each of her own. In my own experience I have seen their efforts collapse completely on three separate occasions where the Church reached out effectively for everyone of the Catholic

name. And in comparing notes with other priests, I find that their experience is the same. The program of the Church of prayer, instruction and correction brings their efforts to naught.

✠ James J. Navagh, D.D.
Auxiliary Bishop of Raleigh

Fifty Years Ago

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for May, 1905, contributed by Fr. T. I. O'Mahony, of All Hallows, Dublin, is a study of a liturgical sequence—the Alleluiatic Sequence, it is called—attributed to Blessed Notker, a ninth-century monk of St. Gall's in Switzerland. This sequence, it seems, was meant for the final *Alleluja* of the Divine Office before Septuagesima Sunday. . . . Fr. E. M. Shapcote, writing on "Mary and the Church Militant," enumerates some of the blessings that have come to the world through Our Lady's intercession. He tells us that "Mary is the point of meeting between the faithful and the eternal purpose of her Son in the same sense that she is the point of union between God and mankind." . . . Fr. Philibert Feasey, O.S.B., in his article "The Easter Sepulchre," describes the Paschal celebrations of pre-Reformation England. These celebrations passed away in the reign of Edward VI, and "in the reign of Mary an attempt was made to restore the old order of things, but her death and the accession of Elizabeth again placed them in a position they were in during the early years of Edward VI's reign, when the rite of the Easter sepulchre with other ancient usages and devotions fell into total desuetude." . . . A very interesting account of some of the historical events in the diocese of Charleston is given by Fr. E. McSweeney, of Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, in his article "Ecclesiastical Charleston." . . . In the Analecta we find a letter from the Sovereign Pontiff, St. Pius X, to the Rector of the American College in Rome, Monsignor Kennedy, congratulating the College on the proficiency of the American students. . . . A question concerning the rumor that Queen Victoria of England was secretly a Catholic and used to visit the Continent every year to make her Easter duty, although she continued to profess the Anglican religion, receives the answer: "It might be admitted that circumstances involving the peace of a great nation and the temporal rights of those dependent upon her position as Queen of England would justify her in not making a public profession of faith . . . but no such reason could have permitted her to profess at the same time the Protestant faith by outward acts of adherence to the National Church."

F. J. C.

THE SORROWS OF MARY

In St. John's Gospel (16:21), we read: "A woman when she is in labor has sorrow, because her hour has come. But when she has brought forth the child, she no longer remembers the anguish for joy that a man is born into the world."

This profoundly true psychological observation may be said to have its parallel in the history of the devotional life of the Church. From earliest days the Church has been likened to a mother who has brought forth in pain a new progeny, redeemed mankind. She suffered her birth-pangs in the Passion and death of Christ, Who is the Head of that new progeny. She cannot, however, forget the joy of His resurrection. In a sense she no longer remembers the anguish in the joy that a new life is born into this world.

It is only by a reflex movement of the mind that a mother, after the pains are over and the child is born, can bring herself to think of what it cost her in suffering to have her present happiness. In a somewhat similar fashion the Church, after the pains of Calvary were over, for a considerable time could not bring herself to think of anything else than the joy of the resurrection and to sing the praises of Mary for having brought the risen Saviour into the world. The crucifixion scene did not enter Christian art until the sixth century. The sorrows of Mary were studied a little earlier, but not, so far as we know, before the fourth century. This does not mean that they were unknown before; but they were not reflected upon and given the theological consideration they were given later. There is nothing unusual about this but it is something to be expected, while the Church, as a true mother, was overwhelmed with the joy brought into the world by the risen Saviour.

Theology began to turn its attention to the sorrows of Mary in the fourth century. From that time on they have never been out of sight. The Mother of Sorrows took an increasingly deeper hold on the minds and hearts of men as the years went on, until popular devotion could not rest content with only one feast to commemorate her sufferings, but demanded two. This is the story we shall attempt to unfold here.

Among the authentic writings of St. Ephrem the Syrian (306-73) we find a "Lament of the Virgin over the Passion of the Lord." This fourth century Lament abounds in tender expressions of pity and compassion put into the mouth of Mary as she beholds the wounds of her Son as He was hanging on the cross. St. Ephrem recognizes in her sorrow and anguish the sword prophesied by Simeon piercing her soul.

At the end of the fourth century St. Ambrose meditates on the Virgin Mother standing by the cross and with eyes full of pity gazing upon the wounds of her Son. The great bishop of Milan, however, was not a sentimentalist. For him Mary is a *mulier intrepida;* she feared not the executioners but, dry-eyed, offered herself to them, while men, even apostles, fled away. She had the courage to do this because what she was witnessing was not so much the death of her Son as the salvation of the world.

A celebrated drama entitled, "The Passion of Christ," has come down to us from an uncertain age. It was once thought to be a work of Gregory Nazianzen; it is now assigned with some probability to Gregory of Antioch, who died towards the end of the sixth century; others date it from the ninth century. In any case, the poem exaggerates when it speaks of the scandal and terror of Mary at the Passion. It is a valuable witness, however, to a deep and tender devotion to the Mother of Sorrows. These sorrows found beautiful expression in the Greek liturgy from the seventh to the tenth centuries.

Many anonymous writings on the sorrows of Mary have come down to us from the late patristic and early middle ages. Some of these became attached to great names, such as St. Anselm and St. Bernard. The authors of others are known to us. There is common agreement among them all that the sufferings endured by Mary were surpassed only by those of her Son. They speak freely of the martyrdom of Mary and they justify the term by recalling the principle that measures the depth of suffering in the soul, which is love. If Mary loved without measure, she suffered without measure. Even the gift of St. John as her son, instead of assuaging her sorrow, in a sense increased it.

Eadmer of Canterbury (d. 1124), a disciple of St. Anselm, stresses the ineffable love in Mary's heart for her Son which caused her to suffer beyond description as she saw Him nailed

to the cross. The exchange of John for her Son did not bring her comfort. How could a man take the place of God, or a servant take the place of the only true Son? The sword of sorrow that pierced her soul caused her to suffer more than all bodily pains; even more than all the tortures endured by the martyrs.

St. Bernard (1090-1153) develops the theme of Mary's martyrdom in a sermon that is found in part in the second nocturn of the feast of the Seven Dolors celebrated on September 15. The sword of sorrow predicted by Simeon pierced her soul, if not her body; but it made her more than a martyr since her compassion exceeded any merely bodily suffering. St. Bernard likewise refuses to see any assuagement of her sorrow in the exchange of a servant for the Lord; of a disciple for the Master; of the son of Zebedee for the Son of God; of a mere man for the true God. Not even Mary's foreknowledge of Christ's death and future resurrection could mitigate the pain she suffered at the crucifixion. Her love and compassion caused her to die in heart if not in body.

Blessed Amadeus of Lausanne (d. 1150) wrote a homily on the martyrdom of Mary in which he distinguishes carefully between two kinds of martyrdom. One is external and bodily; the other is internal and invisible; yet the latter is far greater and far more spiritual than the former. No one suffered more in soul than Mary because no one loved Christ more, for whom she was suffering. He joins Eadmer in the thought that Mary would have died of sorrow were she not sustained and comforted by the divine Spirit of her Son. She shared in the love that animated Christ; she prayed at the foot of the cross for His executioners, and her prayers were heard.

The language of theology is not always the language of popular devotion. The imagination is allowed much greater freedom in sermons and hortatory exercises and in poetry than in strictly scientific explanations. For this reason we shall find later theologians qualifying some of the expressions that devotional writers make use of in speaking of Mary's sorrows at the foot of the cross. While she is rightly called a martyr and the Queen of Martyrs because of the intensity of her sufferings, yet she is not a martyr in the proper sense of the term but only according

to a likeness, as some like to put it.[1] Neither is it altogether correct to say that she was so overwhelmed with suffering and sorrow that only a miracle kept her alive. Statements of this kind ignore the virtue of fortitude which keeps pace with the plentitude of grace in the soul, and Mary's soul was full of grace from the beginning. Even the exchange of St. John for her divine Son must not be pressed too far, as if Christ could ever cease to be Mary's son. The term "exchange" in this connection was never a happy one and we should be grateful that it is no longer in common use.

A more serious exaggeration occurs in the notion that the Blessed Virgin completely fainted away during the Passion and suffered a spasm that left her almost lifeless. The assertion is made in a work entitled, "On the Lamentation of the Virgin," falsely attributed to St. Bernard, that she fell half dead into the arms of Mary Magdalen. The picture has proved attractive to sentimental piety, even to St. Lawrence Justinian, Dionysius the Carthusian, and to St. Bridget in her revelations. It has furnished the inspiration to many poets, sculptors, and painters. It is even reliably reported that St. Helena, the mother of Constantine, erected a chapel in the Holy Land on the spot where Mary swooned away; and Cardinal Cajetan tells us that in his time a feast of the Spasm of the Blessed Virgin Mary was celebrated with an octave. When the Holy See was requested to grant an indulgence for this feast, Cajetan was asked to give his opinion. He wrote a strong condemnation of the view that Mary suffered a spasm of any kind. Maldonatus likened the spasm-theory to an error, while Medina calls it rash, scandalous, and dangerous.[2]

Arnold of Bonnevale (Carnotensis; d. 1160), an intimate of St. Bernard, is a valuable witness to the traditional understanding of the part played by Mary and her sufferings in the work of our redemption. He wrote a treatise on the seven words of Christ on the cross. In his discussion of the word, "Woman, behold thy Son,"[3] he makes use of Old Testament imagery and language in describing the interior, noiseless immolation of Mary

[1] *E.g.* Lépicier and Roschini. Cf. G. M. Roschini, O.S.M., *Mariologia,* II (1948), 211.

[2] Cf. Roschini, *op. cit.,* p. 209.

[3] Cf. *MPL,* CLXXXIX, 1693-98.

on Calvary. Speaking of Calvary in terms of the Old Testament tabernacle, he has this to say:

In that tabernacle you can see two altars; one in the heart of Mary, the other in the body of Christ. Christ immolated His flesh, Mary immolated her soul. Indeed she desired (*optabat*) to add to the blood of her soul the blood of her body also, and with hands lifted up on the cross to celebrate the evening sacrifice with her Son, and with the Lord Jesus to consummate the mystery of our redemption by a bodily death. This, however, was the privilege of the High Priest alone to bring the blood offering within the holies; nor could this dignity be shared with Him by anyone (*nec poterat ei consors haec esse cum aliquo dignitas*), and in the reparation of man His authority was not and could not be communicated to any angel or man (*et in reparatione hominis nulli angelo, nulli homini cum eo fuit, aut esse potuit communis auctoritas*).

Maternal affection, nevertheless, co-operated very much in its own way to propitiate God, since the charity of Christ presented to the Father both His own and His mother's prayers and desires (*vota*); and what the mother sought, the Son approved, and the Father gave. The Father loved the Son, and the Son loved the Father; but the mother burned with love for both (*post utrumque ardebat*). The Father, the Son, and that holy mother had different offices but they intended only one thing, which they labored in common to accomplish. Piety, charity, and the goodness embraced one another when the mother was supplicating, the Son interceding, and the Father showing Himself propitious. The Son was gazing upon the heart and bosom of His mother, while the Father looked at the cross and the wounds of His Son.[4]

In his *De laudibus beatae Mariae Virginis* Arnold uses this language:

Mary immolates herself in spirit for Christ and prays for the salvation of the world, which the Son obtains, and the Father grants. . . . A mother's affection moved [Christ]; and then the will of Christ and of Mary was altogether one, and both likewise offered to God one holocaust; she in the blood of her heart, he in the blood of his flesh . . . so that with Christ she obtains a common effect in the salvation of the world.[5]

---

[4] *Ibid.*, 1694-95.

[5] *Ibid.*, 1726-27.

The preface of the Mass of the Seven Dolors in the Ambrosian liturgy expresses the same thought that is expressed so beautifully by Arnold and other medieval writers:

> The wounds which were inflicted on the most chaste members of Christ were renewed in the heart of the dearest mother by her powerful (*fortis*) love. Christ did not fear to undergo death to wipe out the sins of men; Mary immolated her own heart, rivalling the pain of her dying Son. Christ was crucified in body, Mary in mind. The cruel lance which could not cause any pain to the Son when He was dead, pierced the soul of the mother with a most cruel wound.

In the thirteenth century the sorrows of Mary awakened liveliest sentiments of love and tenderness in prose, in poetry, and in art. In poetry they found their highest expression in the immortal *Stabat Mater dolorosa.* Its authorship is not certain; it has been attributed to St. Gregory the Great (d. 604), St. Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153), Innocent III (d. 1216), St. Bonaventure (d. 1274), Thomas of Celano (d. 1255), Jacopone da Todi (d. 1306), John XXII (d. 1334), and Gregory XI (d. 1378). Scholarship today oscillates between Innocent III and Jacopone da Todi. The Middle Ages, however, were more interested in the hymn than in the hymn-writer. Few hymns attained the popularity of this one, and so rapidly. Its plan is simple: in the first part, down to the line, "dum emisit spiritum," the poet pictures the sorrows of Mary standing by the cross; the second part expresses his tender compassion and ardent desire to share these sorrows.

In the fourteenth century the *Stabat Mater dolorosa* became the indispensable hymn in penitential processions. Even the heretical *Flagellanti* sang it incessantly. A pious confraternity, the *Laudesi,* dedicated to honoring Mary, sang it no less constantly. The seven young men who, in the thirteenth century, had founded this confraternity of "praisers of Mary," a short time later began the Order of Servites (1240), who are specially dedicated to Our Lady of Sorrows.

From popular devotion to official recognition by the Church was but a step. A provincial council held in Cologne in 1423 established a feast, "For the glory of the holy and immaculate Virgin, mother of God . . . and in honor of the anguish and

pain she suffered when Jesus, with hands outstretched on the cross and immolating Himself for our salvation, entrusted His blessed mother to the beloved disciple St. John the Evangelist; and above all in reparation for the impiety of the heretical Hussites who sacrilegiously give to the flames images of Jesus crucified and of the glorious Virgin: we ordain that the commemoration of the anguish and sorrow of the Blessed Virgin be celebrated on the Friday of the fourth week of Lent or, in case of a feast occurring, that it be transferred to the following Friday."

Traces of a feast of Mary's Compassion exist from the fourteenth and even from the thirteenth century, but 1423 marks an official recognition and establishment of the feast by the Church. From Germany the observance of this feast spread rapidly throughout Europe. By the end of the sixteenth century the feast was firmly established in the west, although under different titles. At Cologne it was known as the "Commemoration of the anguish and sorrow of the Blessed Virgin Mary." Elsewhere it was called the feast of Compassion, or of the Lamentation, or of the Transfixion, or of the Sorrows of Mary; the feast of Our Lady of Pity; finally, and most popularly of all, the feast of the Seven Sorrows of Mary. The feast was celebrated at different times in the year until Benedict XIII in 1727 elevated it to the rank of major double and attached it to the Friday of Passion week, where it has remained ever since. It is to be observed, however, that the office and Mass of the feast make no mention of seven sorrows but only of the suffering borne by Mary during the Passion of her Son.

How then did the number seven become attached to the sorrows of Mary? The answer would seem to lie in the spontaneous tendency of the Middle Ages to reduce everything to a determined number. First the joys of Mary were set at seven in the thirteenth century; then, after a period of vacillation, the sorrows also became stationary at seven. (The Seven Holy founders of the Servite Order first practiced devotion to the seven joys of Mary before the seven sorrows.) The number seven had deep symbolic and mystical meaning: it indicated universality. Seven plays an important part in the drama of our salvation. There are seven spirits that stand around the throne

of God and announce deep mysteries to men; the columns of the mystical building erected by wisdom are seven; there are seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, seven infused virtues, seven capital sins, seven sacraments, and seven grades of contemplation, at least according to St. Bonaventure. The seven sorrows of Mary would be a symbolic recapitulation of all her sorrows, especially those she endured at the foot of the cross.

While the sevenfold number of the sorrows of Mary was in use from the thirteenth century, this does not mean that the number remained always fixed at seven. Considerable variation in the numeration existed even during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In the fifteenth century less than seven are sometimes found, even in revelations; for instance, only these five: the prophecy of Simeon, the loss of the child Jesus in the temple, the arrest of Jesus, his crucifixion, the deposition into the arms of his mother. In this fivefold enumeration the flight into Egypt sometimes replaces the arrest of Jesus. On the other hand, the number sometimes rises to fifteen, and Blessed Alan de la Roche, a Dominican who died in 1475, did not hesitate to raise it to one hundred and fifty.

Three manuscripts of the fourteenth century agree upon the sevenfold number of the sorrows of Mary but they differ in telling us what these sorrows are. The three different listings are these:

(1) The prophecy of Simeon; the loss in the temple; the arrest of Jesus; the flagellation and crowning with thorns; the crucifixion; the death and the piercing of the side; the deposition and burial.

(2) The prophecy of Simeon; the slaughter of the Innocents; the loss in the temple; the beginning of the Passion; the crucifixion; the deposition; the burial.

(3) The prophecy of Simeon; the flight into Egypt; the loss in the temple; the arrest; the ascent of Calvary; the crucifixion; the death.

St. Vincent Ferrer (d. 1419) arrives at seven by a different route. In this world there is no joy without its corresponding sorrow. If Mary had seven joys, she must have had seven sorrows. The events that bore this double character for her were: the conception of Christ; His birth; the adoration of the Magi;

the resurrection of Christ; His ascension; the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost; her assumption. The scheme is artificial; and it is not altogether clear how some of these events could be a source of sorrow.

About the year 1500 variation in the number of the sorrows ceased and they became fixed at seven. Variation still existed, however, in naming the seven. Five groupings were in use, of which the first commemorated only the sorrows of Mary during the Passion. The groupings are the following:

(1) Jesus takes leave of Mary to go to His Passion; the crowning with thorns; the nailing to the cross; He is given vinegar to drink; His cry of abandonment by the Father; His death; the deposition into the arms of Mary.

(2) The circumcision; the flight into Egypt; the loss in the temple; the meeting of Mary and Jesus on the way to Calvary; the crucifixion; the deposition; the burial.

(3) The prophecy of Simeon; the flight into Egypt; the loss in the temple; the arrest; the meeting of Jesus and Mary; the nailing to the cross; the deposition.

(4) The flight into Egypt; the loss of Jesus in the temple; the arrest; the meeting of Jesus and Mary; the crucifixion; the death; the burial.

(5) The prophecy of Simeon; the flight into Egypt; the loss in the temple; the meeting of Jesus and His mother; the crucifixion; the deposition; the burial.

The last grouping has prevailed and has become the object of a liturgical cult. The feast celebrated by the Church on September 15 is expressly dedicated to the seven sorrows of Mary. How does it happen that Mary's sorrows are commemorated by two liturgical feasts? Why was another feast established on September 15, when the Church already had a feast to celebrate the same mystery on Friday of Passion week? For answer we must go back to the end of the fifteenth century when wars had made life miserable, especially in the low countries of Europe.

A priest of that region, John of Coudenberghe, began to preach devotion to the seven sorrows of Mary as a means of securing divine aid in times of distress. The devotion evoked an immediate response from the people. A confraternity was formed

in 1491 called the Confraternity of the Seven Dolors, which became popular among all classes. After many miracles were reported and favors granted as a result of this devotion, the Confraternity was approved by the Holy See in 1495 and in 1517. Wednesday was the day dedicated by the Confraternity to the seven dolors; and each year it celebrated the miracles wrought through the intercession of Our Lady of Sorrows on November 13, or on October 1 in some places. This was in addition to the celebration on Friday of Passion week. To the Servites belongs the credit of spreading the devotion to the seven sorrows from Flanders throughout the world. In 1668 they were authorized to celebrate in their Order a special feast in honor of the seven sorrows on the third Sunday of September. Then Pius VII, who cultivated a deep devotion to Our Lady of Sorrows especially during his tribulations at the hands of Napoleon Bonaparte, in 1814 extended this feast to the whole church. With the liturgical reform initiated by St. Pius X the feast became attached to the fifteenth of September, where it now remains.

St. Thomas Aquinas makes a fine distinction between pity (*misericordia*) and sorrow or grief (*dolor*). Pity is the suffering and compassion we feel for others; sorrow or grief we feel for our own misfortune or for the misfortune of those who are one with us, as children or parents.[6] The feast of the Seven Sorrows of Mary emphasizes the union of wills between herself and her Son, especially when He was undergoing His passion. She willed and prayed for what He willed, the salvation of mankind. She suffered ineffably in soul when she saw Him suffering in body, because of her measureless love for Him. That love and those sufferings were, to use the language of St. Pius X, a meritorious cause *de congruo* of all the redemptive graces that her divine Son merited for us *de condigno*. As Arnold Carnotensis puts it: Mary at the foot of the cross "immolates herself in spirit for Christ and prays for the salvation of the world, which the Son obtains, and the Father grants."

In the year 1343 Clement VI, speaking of the satisfaction of Christ, has given us a proper estimate of the value of His sufferings in reference to our redemption. He tells us that even a small

[6] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 30, a. 1, *ad 2.*

drop of His blood would have sufficed for the redemption of the whole human race because of its union with the Word. As a result, Christ has left us an infinite treasury which men may draw on; and we need not fear that this treasury will ever be exhausted, since the merits of Christ are infinite. We can, therefore, and we must say that because of the hypostatic union the sufferings of Christ have an infinite value. By themselves, without any co-operation or additional merits on the part of anyone else, they were sufficient and more than sufficient to redeem the whole world. Besides, as St. Thomas teaches, only the sufferings of Christ could make adequate and condign satisfaction for offenses against One whose dignity is absolutely speaking infinite.[7]

In this way theology preserves the sacred truth revealed in the inspired word: "There is one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus who gave himself a redemption for all" (*I Tim.* 2:5).

At the same time, Clement VI, who defends the all-sufficiency of the merits of Christ, does not hesitate to speak of the merits of the Blessed Virgin and of all the elect existing side by side with Christ's merits. They do not add to the merits of Christ since they draw all their sufficiency from Him. In estimating the value of her sufferings we do not lose sight of the fact that the Queen of the Universe, though highest of all who are merely creatures, is nevertheless a creature who is not hypostatically united with divinity.

The sufferings of Mary did not and could not have the same infinite value as the sufferings of her divine Son. We, however, cannot measure their value because the love that caused them is beyond our comprehension. They played the part of a motivating cause in our redemption because the Father no less than the Son was pleased by the love that lay behind such suffering and accepted the offer of both as part of the antidote for sin. If it was due to the Son of Mary that mankind should be redeemed through His passion and death, it was eminently fitting that this boon should also be granted in view of the prayers and sufferings of that Mother whose will was entirely one with that of her Son.

WILLIAM R. O'CONNOR

New York, N. Y.

[7] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 1, a. 2, *ad* 2.

EVANSTON AND ROME

The Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches might have been expected to take a stand regarding the Catholic Church. From the earliest years, the shadow of Rome hovered over the first beginnings of the Council. In 1919 when the founders of the future Council were canvassing for member churches, they called on the Holy Father and invited his co-operation, which he courteously declined. In 1937, at the opening service of the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order, the Archbishop of York declared: "We deeply lament the absence from this collaboration of the great Church of Rome—the Church which more than any other has known how to speak to the nations so that the nations hear."[1] In 1948, at the First Assembly of the World Council in Amsterdam, one of the principal topics of discussion was on "The Roman Catholic Church and the Ecumenical Movement." And shortly before Evanston, in the opening address at the Lund Conference on Faith and Order in 1952, the chairman, Archbishop Brilioth, frankly stated, "That the Church of Rome has not found it possible to take active part in any of the gatherings which we have been used to call ecumenical in spite of the absence of so large a part of the Christian world, is a tragic fact which we have had to accept."[2]

Since the Catholic Church is the living answer to the main problem which faced the Evanston delegates, "Our Disunity as Churches," they declared themselves on the subject in so many ways that the result is a valuable commentary on the whole ecumenical movement. It may be added by way of prelude, in the words of one of its spokesmen, that "This is not really a World Council of Churches, but a World Council of Church Leaders."[3] Nevertheless when these leaders represent 170 million church members, their statements can be taken as a fair index of how the people in general feel towards Rome.

[1] *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order* (London, 1938), p. 20.

[2] *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order* (London, 1953), p. 106.

[3] *The Living Church* (Sept. 19, 1954), p. 6. Quoted from a press conference of Bishop Berggrav of Norway.

In the present study, the intention is not to analyze or evaluate the various sentiments expressed at the Assembly, beyond a few comments when strictly called for. The main purpose is to give an adequate sampling, in direct quotation, of the "Roman feeling" that prevailed at Evanston. For lack of space, it is impossible to give either all the public references to the Catholic Church or to quote them *in extenso*. Yet no major reference will be consciously omitted, with a special effort to reflect faithfully the over-all picture, which is generally critical, but not without some bright lines coming from quarters where we should least expect them.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Bishop Barbieri and Latin America

Each of the seven days of speeches before the Accredited Visitors at Evanston had a theme idea around which the talks were to center. The heaviest day was August 20, the day of President Eisenhower's visit, when six addresses by as many speakers were delivered on the subject of "The Present State of Religious Liberty." The opening speaker was Sante Barbieri, Methodist Bishop of Buenos Aires in Argentina, who was later elected one of the six presidents of the World Council. Under the suggestive title of "Crucial Situations in Latin America," he gave what proved to be the most extensive—and violent—anti-Roman address of the Assembly. Newspaper reports have generally softened the harsh tone which pervaded the speech and omitted some of the principles on which Barbieri founded his thesis, that the Roman Catholic Church is still trying to maintain a 300-year-old "iron curtain" in Latin America. The basis for the Church's "totalitarian" ecclesiastical authority, he asserted, is "the underlying Catholic philosophy of 'Ubi Roma, ibi Ecclesia,' i.e., 'Where Rome is, there is the Church,' by which there is no other way to become and remain a Christian except through the agency and the ministration of the Church of Rome." From this he drew the strange inference that, "Outside her fellowship there is either Paganism or Apostacy and both these things, in the multiplicity of their manifestations, have to be eliminated by whatever means are at hand, if not by persuasion, then by force, if force can be exerted either directly or indirectly."[4]

[4] *Crucial Situations in Latin America*, No. V-9, p. 1.

Starting with these premises, the field was open for a series of charges that the governments in Latin America, under Catholic pressure, are unjustly curtailing the religious liberties of non-Catholic denominations. The accusations were promptly branded by the Colombian Ambassador to the United States as "gross exaggerations," but in Barbieri's address they were needed to support the pre-determined conclusion that "we find the Roman Church siding always with the most reactionary political forces, because these are more akin to her ecclesiastical philosophy, and because they are the most natural allies to a system, which, by nature and constitution, is the most totalitarian of all."[5]

The bishop revealed his hand, however, when he aligned himself with the "liberal" philosophy against which he admits the Catholic Church has been fighting for over a century in Latin America. "For more than three centuries she was the only and undisputed religious force with tremendous economic and political power, and so could never accept the liberal spirit of the Latin American Constitutions, which were written mainly under the inspiration of the thinkers who were responsible for the French Revolution."[6] As a consequence, "the liberal spirit of those Constitutions has been a thorn in her flesh and the effort to eliminate it has been unceasing and untiring, with the result that she has succeeded in many countries in modifying it, so as to regain at least some of the privileges she enjoyed in Colonial times."[7]

Gutierrez-Marin and the Protestants in Spain

"There has never been religious freedom in Spain, although people have always fought for it," was the opening statement of Dr. Gutierrez-Marin, President of the Spanish Evangelical Church, speaking on the same day as Bishop Barbieri. About half as long as the latter's speech, Marin's address was also more restrained, though not less critical of Catholic policy and principle in Franco's Spain. Variations in the tolerance of non-Catholics seem to follow a pattern: "the extent of tolerance which they enjoyed has always depended on the relative closeness of the relations between the state and the Roman Catholic Church. Thus:

Before the turn of the century tolerance toward Protestantism was on the increase and reached its climax when Spain adopted its Re-

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 2. [6] *Ibid.* [7] *Ibid.*

publican constitution. Then the new regime came into power and a radical change took place. The tolerance which is granted to Spanish Protestants today has been reduced to a minimum and this, in turn, corresponds exactly to the close relationship between the state and the Catholic Church without which the concordat concluded in 1953 would not have been possible.[8]

Unwittingly, Gutierrez-Marin pays high tribute to the solid, often militant, Catholicism in the Iberian peninsula:

> The Inquisition guaranteed the purity and the absolute domination of Catholic doctrine.
>
> In Spain the Protestant movement of the Reformation period was completely annihilated.
>
> In Spain the spirit which prevails in state and church today shows an astonishing similarity with the spirit of the 16th and 17th centuries: The same will toward unity in ecclesiastical affairs, the same conviction that Catholicism is the only true religion, the same imperialist outlook, the same messianism, the same attitude toward the "ultimate issues."[9]

But we are no longer in the 16th and 17th centuries. Hence a measure of freedom is allowed the Protestants that was unheard of in former times. For example, Article 27 of the Concordat with the Holy See "provides that lessons in the Catholic religion shall be obligatory from grade school to university. But the sons and daughters of non-Catholics are exempt, if the parents or their representatives apply for such exemption."[10]

Moreover, although "none of the Evangelical Churches in Spain is legally recognized," the Protestant denominations continue to operate and even develop, due to a "de facto" recognition that is generally passed over by anti-Spanish polemists. Technically, "a special permit of the provincial governor or of the highest political official is needed" to hold Protestant church services and other religious meetings. But actually:

> Today there are 12 Protestant congregations in Madrid and 15 in Barcelona. Their total membership is approximately 5,000. It is estimated that in the entire country there are approximately 300 Protestant congregations comprising . . . 30,000 souls.

---

[8] *The Situation of the Protestants in Spain,* No. V-13, p. 1.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

Almost all congregations have a Sunday school for children and the young people are organized in youth groups. There is a training institute for future clergymen in Madrid and one in Barcelona. The existence of all this indicates that there is a certain "de facto" recognition of Protestantism in Spain, but above all it shows the faithful persistence of the Spanish Protestants who until 1945, apart from rare exceptions, were permitted to meet only in private houses and in no church rooms whatsoever.[11]

Unlike Barbieri, Marin recognized the right which the Spanish State has to protect the religious interests of its Catholic subjects. He does not even quarrel with the government's special concessions to the Catholic Church. But, inconsistently, he urges that since Protestants have a right to "act according to their conscience," they also have a right to evangelize, i.e. proselytize among the Spanish Catholics. "Propaganda or proselytizing," he complains, "is strictly prohibited." So that "Spanish Protestantism is denied the right to make itself known to a broader public."[12] It is worth noting how shrewdly Marin appealed to political pressure being brought upon Spain to make her grant still greater concessions in favor of 30,000 Protestants, many of them non-Spaniards, who constitute about one thousandth of the country's population. "Today Spain is no longer an empire, and cannot afford isolationism." Though her leaders still speak of a "spiritual empire," it "has to co-exist with other nations. In part it needs their help and must, therefore, take certain precautions. The Protestants partly benefit from this" physical necessity turned into moral persuasion.[13]

Reuben Nelson on Religious Freedom in the United States

The last speech in the series on religious freedom was made by Dr. Nelson, Secretary of the American Baptist Convention, on "The Churches of the United States and the Cause of Freedom." After describing America as an "eternal haven of freedom," and declaring that "contemporary threats to religious liberty are of a different type from those contemplated by the writers of our Constitution," he elaborated on what he considered the radical current danger to freedom of conscience in this country. Certain religious groups, notably Roman Catholics, are committed to an authoritarian system of theology which it is hard, if not impossible,

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 3. [12] *Ibid.* [13] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

to reconcile with the independence of thought required in a politically democratic society like the United States. Consequently "the threat to religious freedom in basic issues is ever with us in the Roman system of doctrine and practice. We do not desire to elaborate upon this system, which asserts its infallibility and leaves no room either for adequate question or answer by the individual. We know that there are thinking, independent members of that communion, but a look at Spain and Italy leads us to some disturbing questions." The problem is: "Can a people brought up on a spiritual program of complete acquiescence be expected to assert their right to individual judgment in other areas of thought? Must not this pattern of conformity inevitably congeal into totalitarianism?"[14]

Dr. Nelson did not answer the question but went on to explain that the real issue at stake is an unfortunate equation between Christianity and authoritarianism which, in the secular sphere, means "reactionary politics." The danger is that, "whatever our religion may be, if religious conviction causes us to abdicate the throne of our intelligence and let someone else decide what we are to think, and do, and be—then we are ready recruits for 'the man on the white horse' who may some day ride down the streets of our cities offering to do our thinking for us."[15]

The position of the Roman Catholic Church in America is unique. It has an obligation to solve "the problem of adjustment to democratic action in a measure not experienced in any other nation. And the adjustment must take into account a laity produced in great Universities not associated with the faith, where indoctrination is not so easily accomplished nor the insulation from progressive ideas so easily assured." Then on a personal note, "Many of us have gained a profound respect for thoughtful Roman lay people. One of our hopes for a successful solution of our problem lies in keeping the avenues of communication open with such laymen."[16] In other words, since the hierarchy and clergy of the Catholic Church are wedded on principle to the "religion of the right," with its consequent "reactionary politics," in order to protect the States from totalitarianism and the union of Church and State, "thoughtful Roman laypeople" should be

[14] *The Churches of the United States and the Cause of Freedom,* No. V-14, p. 2. [15] *Ibid.* [16] *Ibid.,* pp. 3-4.

encouraged to show their independence of a religious system "which teaches men how to apply formulas but not to discover them."[17]

ORTHODOX CHURCHES AND ROMAN CATHOLICISM

The intransigent attitude of the Orthodox delegates at Evanston was in striking contrast to the other churches represented in the World Council. On all the main issues which the Council adopted as its official mind, the Orthodox publicly registered their disapproval. After their spokesman had repudiated the Council's Faith and Order report on Church unity, "it left some people wondering why, if they held these views, they wished to continue in the Assembly."[18] The fact is their presence in the World Council is much valued. "We want to keep them," is the opinion of the Protestants. "They agree with us in so much that we have to say, but they must be allowed to express their dissent on certain points."[19]

Basil Ionnides of the University of Athens

Consistent with this policy of dissidence was the address given by Basil Ionnides, professor of theology at the University of Athens, who spoke to the Accredited Visitors on "Unity in the Light of Our Common Heritage." His thesis was simple. "There are many who claim that all existing Christian Communions are imperfect and we should not draw our ideal from any of them, but only from the Church of New Testament times. Our meeting place, they say, must be only the Bible and of biblical times. The one Church of Christ, the *Una Sancta,* does not exist any more and we must seek for it in the apostolic age." But "the Eastern Orthodox Church completely rejects such a viewpoint and holds the view first that the *Una Sancta,* the one catholic and apostolic Church, has never disappeared; and secondly that our meeting-place must be the life and the faith of the one, ancient and undivided Church of the first nine centuries of the Church's history. The

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 3.

[18] *The Christian Century,* Editorial (Sept. 22, 1954), p. 1129.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 1130. Statement by Dr. John Baillie, one of the newly elected presidents of the World Council, and chaplain to Queen Elizabeth of England.

ecumenical Church is the ancient and undivided Church as it existed before the tenth century Schism when East and West belonged together."[20]

Having disposed of the Protestants, Ionnides turned to the Church of Rome, with surprising sympathy. He had three choices before him, any one of which has been held by Orthodox theologians: to declare that Rome is in heresy, or in schism, or in possession of the true faith.[21] At least by implication, he took the latter choice.

In June, 1894, Pope Leo XIII addressed an Apostolic Letter to the rulers and nations of the world, with a view to lead them back to the unity of the true faith. A year later, on October 12, the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople published a rejoinder to the Pope's invitation, advising his people "to be on their guard against the false prophet who, coming in the clothing of a lamb, seeks to seduce them by vain and deceitful promises."[22] Dr. Ionnides recalled the papal letter and also the reaction it provoked among the Orientals. Significantly, however, he avoids the "irreverent and bitter language" of the Patriarch, and quotes only that section from the latter's reply to Leo XIII which allows of an irenic interpretation. "The Eastern Church," he explained, "as was declared by the Holy Synod of Constantinople in its answer to the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII: 'In view of the sacred purpose of re-union, is ready to acknowledge freely, if it can be shown that she has altered anything from, or lost the possession of anything of, the common possession of the Eastern and Western Churches' united life in the first nine centuries.' "[23]

There is no suggestion here that Rome is not in possession of the common doctrine of the East and West in the first nine centuries; only a defense against the imputation that the Orthodox Church has not preserved this tradition intact. The speaker went on to declare that the Orthodox communion "has preserved unchanged the apostolic faith and the apostolic tradition as the Apos-

[20] *Unity in the Light of Our Common Heritage,* p. 3.

[21] Spacil, Theophilus, *Orientalia Christiana,* 8 (Rome, 1924), 88-89.

[22] *AER* (Feb., 1896), pp. 99-100. This is the first of a series of four articles by the editor of *Civiltà cattolica,* in answer to the Patriarch's rejoinder to Pope Leo XIII.

[23] Ionnides, p. 3.

tles handed it down to the Church,"[24] but not a word of negative criticism, denying that the Roman Church along with the Orthodox is the *Una Sancta* of the Fathers. Considering the outspoken rejection of any such claim by the Protestant bodies, this attitude on the part of the Greek delegation is encouraging.

Archbishop Michael of the Archdiocese of the Two Americas

Equally conciliatory from the Catholic standpoint was the address of Archbishop Michael of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, who spoke at the plenary session on "The Tensions of the World and Our Unity in Christ." The burden of his message was a protest against proselytism of one Christian denomination among the communicants of another, particularly of the projected Protestant evangelism among the Greeks and Russians behind the Iron Curtain, once those countries are opened to missionary enterprise. He called this "most disquieting and saddens us profoundly—because we believe that this interest [of evangelizing Russia] is derived from selfish motives, from motives entirely incompatible with the spirit of love and of mutual understanding that should characterize not only every Christian but generally everyone in the world, everyone who has a Common Father, our God in Heaven; because we steadfastly believe also that our brothers in Russia today, clergy and people alike, hold firmly to the Orthodox Faith to the utmost that is permitted by the conditions and circumstances under which they live."[25]

Instead of planning grandiose missionary schemes, "the first and most important responsibility we have toward these brothers of ours, whether they be Orthodox, or Roman Catholics, or Protestants, or Jews . . . is prayer in their behalf—regular and systematic prayer—such as moves mountains, accomplishes miracles, makes possible the impossible."[26]

Moreover, instead of competing with one another, Christian Churches should meet together, through accredited representatives, "for the friendly discussion of such matters as keep us apart." There is not enough of such examination of basic doctrinal differences among the members of the World Council. To illustrate

[24] *Ibid.*
[25] *The Tensions of the World and Our Unity in Christ,* No. 12-A, p. 3.
[26] *Ibid.*

how things should be done, the archbishop recalled his relations with "a very dear friend who has distinguished himself in the field of Roman Catholic theology, a man whom I have known for many years. I must admit that he examines the existing differences between our Churches with a genuine impartiality and a thorough independence of mind." So much so that when some time ago, "we discussed again certain basic differences between our Churches, Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, we found ourselves fundamentally in virtual agreement, and if the union of the two Churches depended on the two of us, there would perhaps come very very soon that gladsome joyous consequence."[27]

A similar instance was the famous Malines Conversations held between Cardinal Mercier and "the late lamented Lord Halifax," and approved by Rome.[28] "These two men, outstanding for the profundity of their spiritual life, had by their cooperation generated in the hearts of many Christians the hope of a friendly collaboration between the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church. If this endeavor had continued even after the passing of these illustrious gentlemen, perhaps the relations of the two Churches would have been brought much closer than they are today."[29]

The archbishop's final recommendation is the prayerful study of the Scriptures and the reading of the "wonderful masterpieces of the Great Fathers and Teachers of the Church." Seven authors are suggested: three saints and four spiritual writers. The saints are Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom; the writers are Thomas A' Kempis, the Jesuit Nicholas Grou, and two obscure authors whose religious affiliation is unknown. In all of these works, the Assembly was told, "Christians of all denominations" will find ample material "to create and develop [their] spiritual life."[30] Once this is achieved, the problem of unity among the Churches is more than half solved.

ROMAN AUTHORITARIANISM

Inevitably the difference was emphasized between the freedom of spirit enjoyed by non-Roman Churches and the rigid authori-

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[28] The best study is by Lord Halifax, *The Conversations at Malines, 1921-25: Original Documents* (London, 1930).

[29] Archbishop Michael, p. 5. [30] *Ibid.*

tarianism of Roman Catholicism. However, an obvious difficulty which first had to be removed was the status of the Orthodox communions, members of the World Council, and yet notoriously authoritarian. Samuel Cavert of the Presbyterian Church in U. S. A. handled the problem in a talk on "The Ecumenical Movement Today," in which he admitted that, "As to the *nature* of the unity which we seek as our goal, there are, of course, different views within the ecumenical movement." In general, though, the tendency seems to be in the direction of "a visible and manifest unity," going "beyond the cooperation of separated and independent denominations." Then the crucial problem: "How to achieve such a unity without losing the values of a rightful freedom and a rightful diversity." Whatever solution is offered, however, the unity must not be "a centralized or monolithic administration on a world scale." Then he added:

> At this point the Eastern Orthodox pattern (in contrast with the Roman Catholic) reinforces the Protestant. For Eastern Orthodoxy contemplates churches which are autonomous for administrative purposes, but which share a common faith, are linked in common worship and fellowship, and are guided by ecumenical councils of a representative character.[31]

The World Council seeks unity, therefore, but not the type exhibited by Roman Catholicism. It prefers something along the lines of Eastern Orthodoxy, where authority is vested in democratic councils which, according to the Orientals, have not convened in ecumenical session since the Second Council of Nicea in 787.

An illustration of the "stifling effect of Roman authoritarianism" was given by Pastor Lauriol, in reporting on "The Work of Christians in the Social Struggle in France." After a glowing tribute to the social work of the Reformed Churches in his country, Lauriol observed that, "Our (Roman) Catholic brethren are not lagging behind. They have their 'Social Weeks' (Semaines sociales), their 'Young Catholic Workers' (J.O.C.), their 'French Confederation' (C.F.T.C.)." Until recently, they also had "that wonderful movement called 'Working Priests' (prêtres-ouvriers) who, for the purpose of bringing the Gospel to the workers, had

[31] *The Ecumenical Movement Today*, No. V-26, p. 4.

become working men themselves, and lived on the same salary." However, "this venture unfortunately has just been smashed, and that not by the French bishops, but by an order emanating from Rome. We also have 'working ministers' who might also act rashly, or even go astray. Have no fear: our Protestant Churches will advise them, will reprove them if necessary, but will always back them up."[32]

The most significant statement on Roman intolerance was made by Eivind Berggrav, Bishop of Oslo, one of the presidents of the World Council. Speaking of "The Tensions of the World and Our Unity in Christ," he charged that the worst tension calling for remedy is not between the churches and the world but within the churches themselves—the suspicion, distrust and sometimes antagonism of one Christian body towards another.

His plea therefore was for charity and tolerance, at whatever cost to self-interest, and no matter how contrary the principles or policy of the offending ecclesiastical body, even where the offender is the Church of Rome. "Let us take the bull by the horns: Is there not in many of our churches anger, sometimes also fear, towards the Church of Rome? And is there not only very, very seldom a bit of respect, not to speak of a sense of love?" He anticipated the objection: "I know that you want to interrupt me here and ask: How could we love Rome? My answer would be by means of a question: Does Christ love them? Has he sacrificed himself for them?" This calls for a distinction: "Not, of course, for the organization of the fabric of that Church, but for all its members. Is there love in Christ for these men and these women, yes, even for their priests, wrong-thinking and seemingly also sometimes wrong-doing, as we may consider them? There can be only one answer."[33]

The bishop then explained the fundamental grievance against the Church of Rome, which flows from the kind of unity desired by the members of the World Council. It is not the unity of authority, but a unity of Christian fellowship:

> Our unity in Christ, if taken seriously, prevents us from self-aggrandizement and the feeling of having a monopoly of all truth and

---

[32] *The Work of Christians in the Social Struggle in France,* No. V-20, pp. 3-4.

[33] *The Tensions of the World and Our Unity in Christ,* No. 13-A, p. 3.

wisdom, or of being entitled to be the judges of our fellow-churches rather than being their brethren in Christ. And church prestige is doomed by Christ himself. There exists *no master church* above the others. What we have got is a "church family" in Christ.[34]

More simply, Christ is said not to have founded one Church but a family of churches. He did not commit to any one body the plenitude of revelation but scattered His teaching over scores of denominations, none of which has the fulness but all a part of the Gospel truth. The implication is that truth may not only be fragmented but mutually contradictory, as among the churches of Protestantism, and yet be considered worthy of the Son of God who revealed it.

TRIBUTE TO CATHOLIC MISSIONARIES

The plenary sessions on August 24 studied the problem of Christian evangelization in the modern world, and were highlighted by the greatest tribute paid at Evanston to the missionary work of the Catholic Church. Dr. Ranson of the Methodist Church in Ireland spoke on "World-Wide Evangelism," declaring that, "The one great task which has been given to the Church is to preach the Gospel to the ends of the earth and to the end of time."[35] He emphasized the fact that in view of present-day "contraction of human society," effected by the rapid means of communication, a new duty is incumbent on all Christians to prosecute the "apostolic mission to the world."

"In this year of our Lord," he said, "we celebrate the twelve hundredth anniversary of the death of one of the greatest missionaries in Christian history. St. Boniface was martyred on June the 4th, 754." The ministry which he accomplished came at one of the "great turning points of history," not unlike our own:

> It was a moment dark with foreboding for the Christian Church. The hammer of Islam has struck with shattering force. . . . Within a century of the prophet's death, the cry: "Allah is most great" was heard from Spain to China. The Christian Church had suffered terrible losses and its whole future hung apparently in the balance. The issue at stake was whether Christianity or Islam should be the world religion of the future. Christianity in England was weak. Almost all

---

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[35] *World-Wide Evangelism in This Generation*, No. 10-A, p. 1.

Germany was heathen. Italy was hopelessly distracted. France was the only strong Christian state in Western Europe. And the fanatical armies of Mohammed were on French soil, with a record of staggering successes behind them. This was not an auspicious moment for a great missionary venture. Yet it was at this moment that an English Benedictine monk heard his Lord say: "As the Father hath sent me, even so I send you."[36]

Boniface's response was utterly selfless. "Turning his back upon the offer of ecclesiastical preferment at home, he set out to evangelize the pagan peoples of Northern Europe. To his contemporaries, this may have seemed a foolish enterprise, for the way of the Cross has always appeared as foolishness to the world." Yet:

> It is of Boniface that a modern historian has recently written: "No Englishman has had a greater influence on the world." Without underestimating the importance of the victory of Charles Martel, which turned the tide of Islamic military expansion, it can be said that in the perspective of history the most significant thing that was happening in that rough, turbulent and critical era was the missionary labour of Boniface and his monks. It was their fidelity to the Gospel which, under God, shaped the Christian future.[37]

The lesson is unmistakable. "The Church stands today at a point in history no less critical than that which confronted it at the beginning of the eighth century. We have seen developments in our time which bear a striking similarity to some of the things which happened in the age of Boniface."[38] There are differences, of course; but "the essential mission" of preaching the Gospel to every creature remains the same.

Dr. Ranson then asked: "What does world-wide evangelism mean today?" He answered with a statement of encouragement and a warning. "The Christian faith is by far the most widely disseminated of all the faiths—religious and secular—that have ever come into existence in the world." However this must not be exaggerated:

> Despite the remarkable geographical extension of the Church there are still vast areas of the world where the name of Christ has never

---

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 2. [37] *Ibid.* [38] *Ibid.*

been heard and where there is still no hindrance to the preaching of the Gospel save the lack of a messenger. Despite the impressive fact that month by month tens of thousands of people are being added by baptism unto the Church in many parts of Africa and Asia and Latin America, the growth of world population exceeds enormously the numerical extension of the Church. Measured even in these superficial statistical terms the unfinished task of world evangelism is more formidable than it was when Francis Xavier set out on his Asian mission.[39]

A final lesson from Catholic evangelism which the speaker proposed to the Assembly was the principle of missionary mobility recently expounded by a French Catholic priest. The Abbé Godin "in his remarkable book, *France—Pays de Mission?* wrote that 'the apostle must never be *installé dans la vie.*'" This means:

> The missionary must never appear to have settled down in this world. Christians must live as those who have no continuing city. What result would it have in the life of the Church and in the effective fulfillment of the world Christian mission if that were accepted and intelligently applied? Is it not true of the Church in every part of the world that its apostles appear to be pretty firmly *installé dans la vie*? They do not always give the impression of a Church militant and mobile—or as Godin puts it, "wholly geared to conquest." If the Church really did move "like a mighty army" there would be some interesting changes in the deployment of our total resources.[40]

Ranson concluded by deprecating the character of non-Catholic missionary expansion, which is taking place "within the framework of a denominationally divided Church." The result can only be "the projection across the world of the historic divisions of western Christendom." Granted that "we most surely believe . . . Christ's Church is one. But the failure to express in visible form the unity given in Christ is a formidable obstacle to effective world evangelism."[41]

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND ROME

The closing address of the plenary session of the Assembly on August 29 was to have been delivered by Reinhold Niebuhr, professor of Christian Ethics at the Union Theological Seminary, consultant to the World Council, and regarded by admirers as the most fearless theological critic of our age. At the last minute,

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 3. [40] *Ibid.* [41] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

his physician advised him not to make the trip to Evanston, "where every delegate is his friend and . . . where the demands on his strength would inevitably have been very great."[42] He was recovering from a sickness which attacked him about a year before. However, the speech he prepared was delivered for him by Dr. Angus Dun, Episcopalian Bishop of Washington, D. C., under the title, "Our Dependence Is Upon God." In many ways it was the outstanding address of the Assembly, critically analyzing the reasons why "we represent the fragmented portions of a universal church." It was also the most weighty attack on Roman Catholicism made at the Evanston convention.

Niebuhr began by stating his general theme, that the facts of history and the injunctions of Scripture "warn us that it is the business of the Christian Church to bear witness not to the righteousness of Christians but to the righteousness of God," in accordance with the Reformation principle of man's complete depravity.[43] Stated more simply, the important lesson for Christianity to teach is the "reliability of God and the unreliability of men, even in their wisest and most virtuous moments."[44] It is a lesson we are slow to learn, in spite of the manifest evidence of centuries of experience, especially as taught us by the "historic movements which destroyed the unity of the church for the sake of restoring the purity of the gospel," in the Eastern Schism and the Protestant Revolt.[45]

Unless we learn this truth, Niebuhr claimed, we shall "make the mistake of assuming that the majesty and unity of the church as the body of Christ is necessary to his glory."[46] It is not and cannot be, because even where the shell of ecclesiastical unity is most apparent, it hides an inner core of sin and evil as inevitable as the unreliable human beings of which the church is composed. The classic example is Roman Catholicism:

> The unity of the Roman church is indeed impressive, and in some respects enviable, in comparison with our unhappy divisions. But the Roman church maintained this unity and a part of the substance of the gospel truth at the price of building two great heresies into the Christian message.[47]

---

[42] *The Christian Century* (Sept. 1, 1954), p. 1026.
[43] *Our Dependence Is Upon God,* No. 15-A, p. 3.
[44] *Ibid.,* p. 4. [45] *Ibid.* [46] *Ibid.* [47] *Ibid.*

The first heresy was to conceive the Church as the extension of the Incarnation, to invest it with the very attributes of God, to exalt it

> . . . as essentially divine, as the mediator of God's judgment, rather than as the locus in human history where the judgments of God can be heard, whether on the righteous or the unrighteous. This heresy was to obscure the chasm between the human and the divine, which the prophets of Israel understood so well; to pretend that there were priests who were privy to God's counsels, were in control of God's redemptive powers and purposes and in possession of the "keys of heaven."[48]

The second heresy was "either consequent or ancillary" to the previous one. Since the Church was claimed to be divine, it assumed authority to dictate to men how they might work out their salvation:

> It changed the gospel of forgiveness to contrite souls into a great scheme for assuring men of their salvation if they would climb a "ladder of merit," chiefly by castigating the passions of the body. This ladder of merit, these ascetic disciplines, did not however guarantee that the self in the pretensions of its self-esteem would be shattered by the "severity" of the divine judgment, that a new self would arise from the crucifixion of the old self.[49]

Dr. Niebuhr felt it was too obvious to have to "recount how these heresies not only changed the message of redemption in Christ but also constructed a very imposing institution and a very vexatious and pretentious priesthood, pretending to have dominion over all the nations in the name of Christ."[50] Clearly, then, "justice and freedom could not be established on earth, even as the gospel could not be truly preached, until these pretensions were challenged."[51]

They were challenged, notably by the Protestant Reformers and their disciples, who wished to protect the world from enslavement by this human colossus which called itself divine. Noble as it was, the effort suffered from the common curse of human unreliability. Seeking to purify the Scriptures of Roman idolatry, the Reformers became infected with other heresies, no less apparent than the errors of Rome:

> The fact that it has not been possible to purge the gospel of these Roman heresies without exposing it to the corruption of new heresies

---

48 *Ibid.* 49 *Ibid.* 50 *Ibid.* 51 *Ibid.*

and of dragging the church behind the chariot wheels of every nation, is as instructive to the Christian as the first chapter of this contest between the righteousness of God and the righteousness of men.[52]

Reflecting on the status of the churches separated from her, "the Roman church has a right to interpret our condition, divided by the intrusion of every historically relative insight and condition into the Christian message, as analogous to the biblical parable of the 'house swept and garnished,' of the man exorcised of one devil of heresy who was visited by 'seven devils more evil than the first.' "[53]

Worse, however, than the sectarian disunity of the churches is the doctrinal corruption into which they have fallen through becoming wedded to ephemeral human philosophies:

> It is not only that every national and parochial viewpoint colored the Christian message among us, but that our necessary commerce with the culture of the world, particularly in the 19th century, produced every form of quasi-heresy in which Kantian, Freudian or Marxist forms of thought usurped the wisdom of Christ and the foolishness of the cross with some form of worldly wisdom.[54]

Estimate of Niebuhr's Attack

Niebuhr's stricture of Rome comes as no surprise to anyone familiar with his writings. Over the years, his opposition has centered around the one point that Catholicism regards itself as "an extension of the Incarnation," and therefore has "usurped the majesty of God." Without going into details to answer this charge or to vindicate the Church's title to divinity, it will be enough here to expose the basic inconsistency of Niebuhr's position. Catholics are not alone in taking him to task for posing as a Christian while denying, with militant zeal, the radical doctrine of the Christian faith, which is the divinity of Christ.

To his mind, "the doctrine that Jesus was both human and divine [is] religiously and morally meaningful, and dispenses with the necessity of making the doctrine metaphysically plausible."[55] Referring to the Council of Chalcedon which defined that the

[52] *Ibid.* [53] *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5. [54] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[55] *The Nature and Destiny of Man:* II, *Human Destiny* (New York, 1943), p. 70.

divine and human natures of Christ are united "inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably," he characterizes this as "wooden-headed literalism of orthodoxy."[56] When describing the personality of Jesus, he declares, "it is not possible . . . to assert the sinlessness of every individual act of any actually historical character." Correspondingly, Jesus was "a child of his time," in everything but His revelation of love. "Jesus no less than Paul was not free of these historical illusions. He expected the coming of the Messianic Kingdom in his lifetime."[57] And most emphatically: "Since the essence of the divine consists in its unconditional character, and since the essence of the human lies in its conditional and contingent nature, it is not logically possible to assert both qualities of the same person."[58]

As expressed by one Protestant commentator, "the amazing thing about Niebuhr's rejection of Christ's metaphysical divinity . . . is that it does not seem to trouble him much. The issue is by-passed with almost an air of aloofness."[59] Yet he denounces the Roman Church for pretensions to divinity, specifically, to extending the Incarnation of the Son of God into current history. But, we ask, what right or title does he have to oppose such a claim if he repudiates the Incarnation itself? To be logical, he should declare himself opposed to the Church's pretensions, not out of respect for the person of Christ, who is only a "symbol of perfection,"[60] but from conviction that since God never became man, there can be no projection into history of a non-existent reality.

* * * * *

There are two ways that Catholics may react to the "Roman statements" made at Evanston: with regret over the generally hostile attitude towards their Church, or more hopefully that below the surface it was not so much hostility as the fear of Rome which prompted this reaction. Disunited among themselves, yet painfully aware of the towering strength in unity of Roman

[56] *Beyond Tragedy* (New York, 1937), p. 28.

[57] *Human Destiny*, p. 73, and *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* (New York, 1935), p. 57.

[58] *Human Destiny*, p. 70.

[59] Carnell, Edward J., *The Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr* (Grand Rapids, 1951), p. 55.

[60] *Human Destiny*, p. 65.

Catholicism, the delegates and speakers were faced with the hard dilemma of capitulating to Rome or of rationalizing their separation from her body. They chose to rationalize, and therefore criticize; but all the while they recognized that "the great Church of Rome is not indifferent to what is being done in order to further a better understanding between Christians of different traditions."[61]

JOHN A. HARDON, S.J.

West Baden College
West Baden Springs, Ind.

[61] *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order*, p. 106.

A NOTE TO THE SYMBOLIC DEATH OF CHRIST

For the July, 1954, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Fr. Clarence McAuliffe of St. Mary's, Kansas, wrote a very interesting article entitled "The Symbolic Death of Christ." In his article the author discusses the *materia proxima*[1] (the destructive element) in the Mass *qua* sacrifice. "The Symbolic Death" is especially recommended for its prudence, balance, reserve and lack of complicating technicalities.

Reading the interesting discussion of the elements essential to the external, visible offering of the Mass suggests to the reader another, a complementary and far more important requisite of the Mass. This element is so fundamental, and so obvious, that, perhaps because of this basic obviousness, it is too often taken for granted and too seldom explicitly stated. This element is the soul of the Holy Sacrifice.[2]

Just as in the case of the whole man there are two component elements, of which the first is an invisible, internal, informing substance called the soul, and the second is a visible, external *informed* substance called the body, so too for a complete ritual sacrifice there must be two component elements, of which one is the invisible, interior sacrifice by which man lifts up his heart to God in an act of reverence and submission, thereby acknowledging God's absolute dominion and man's absolute dependence as a creature on God, His Creator; the other is the visible offering and destruction of a victim, as a suitable sign of the interior spiritual sacrifice. By analogy this exterior immolation may be called the body of the sacrifice.

Furthermore, this body of the sacrifice is not the primary, but rather the secondary, sacrifice.[3] For it has its meaning and efficacy only in so far as it is related to, and suitably signifies the interior sacrifice, the principal sacrifice[4]—the soul of sacrifice.

Concerning the Mass as a sacrifice, much has been written to explain the extrinsic (external) sacrifice of the Body and Blood

[1] Cf. *AER,* CXXXI, 1 (July, 1954), 13 ff.

[2] R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. *The Love of God and The Cross of Jesus,* II, 385-410 (trans. Sister Jeanne Marie, O.P.).

[3] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* II-II, q. 81, a. 7; q. 85, a. 2; I-II, q. 101, a. 2.

[4] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* II-II, q. 85, a. 4; I-II, q. 101, a. 2.

of Our Lord in the Mass, but comparatively little, I believe, has been written about the interior sacrifice, i.e., the soul of the Mass.

The soul of the Mass is the interior oblation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus offering Himself and being offered, a Supreme Priest and Eternal Victim in the perfect act of obedience and reverence, of religion and worship, of adoration and love to His Heavenly Father. Howsoever we may agree or disagree in explaining the destructive element necessary to the rite of the Mass as a true sacrifice, howsoever we may vary in discussing the inter-relation of the Last Supper, Calvary and today's Mass, nevertheless our great consolation is this: despite (or because of) this mystery of God's Eucharistic love, we agree completely in the notion of the soul of the Mass; that is, in the interior spiritual sacrifice of Christ's Sacred Heart. That same interior oblation was specifically the same for the Last Supper and Calvary, and is specifically the same, I think, for today's Mass.

That same soul of the Mass is in time and yet independent of time. Temporally it is limited to a half-hour's liturgical service, four times each second repeated around the globe. Eternally Christ's interior sacrifice is "measured like the beatific vision neither by the continuous time of our sun, nor by the discrete time of the angels marked off only by their thoughts, but . . . by the moment that never passes, the *nunc stans et non fluens*. . . ."[5]

Just as the soul of the Mass informs the exterior liturgical rite with meaning and efficacy, so too this interior, invisible oblation of Christ the High Priest *in aeternum* informs the visible priesthood with supreme inspiration and intelligibility. For priests at the altar this soul of the Mass should be the centripetal force charging their apostolate with the divine dynamism of devotion. For priests this interior oblation of Christ should focus their thoughts, their sacrifices, their whole being on the very soul of the Consecration, that though this focus priests may enkindle and magnify the interior oblation of the hearts of the faithful. Thus through the indestructible love and spiritual sacrifice of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, we may be forever united to God by the Soul of the Mass.

JOHN P. MURPHY, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

[5] Garrigou-Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 397.

THE PROTESTANT CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH

Since the time of Sabatier, it has become fashionable to contrast religions of authority with the religion of the spirit. Authority is imposition from above; in tendency, it is hierarchical. The spirit is impulsion from within; in tendency, it is mystical.

The Catholic Church claims to be at once a mystical and a hierarchical community. In its mystical aspect it is an organism; it is the Body of Christ, vitally directed by His Spirit. In its hierarchical aspect it is an organization, juridically governed by men.

One of the most persistent elements in Protestant theology is the notion that there exist two Churches—the one mystical or invisible, the other institutional or visible. This dichotomy was introduced into Protestant thinking by Martin Luther, who early in life came to the view that the flesh profited nothing, and that religion was, in its essence, a purely spiritual enterprise. When excommunicated by the ecclesiastical authorities at Rome, Luther maintained that he did not cease to be a member of the invisible Church, which was the true people of God. "For the sake of brevity and better understanding," he declared, "we shall call the two churches by different names. The first, which is the natural, essential, real, and true Church, let us call a spiritual, inner Christendom. The other, which is man-made and external, let us call a bodily, outer Christendom. . . . Those who are destitute of faith and thus outside the first community (but within the second) are dead in the sight of God, hypocrites, and as it were wooden images of true Christians."[1]

The invisible Church, then, is conceived to be a mystical entity, a communion of saints united by the supernatural bonds of faith, hope, and charity. This invisible Church is the *una sancta* of the Creed; it is "without spot or wrinkle"; it is the Body of Christ.

The visible Church (according to most Protestant thinkers) is a necessary supplement to the invisible. Man, being a creature of flesh and blood, cannot acquire faith unless he is led to it by the

[1] "The Papacy at Rome," *Works of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia, Pa.: United Lutheran Publication House, 1915 ff.), I, 355 f. (translation modified).

external actions of other men—specifically, by the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. Calvin is especially emphatic on the necessity of membership in an organized congregation in which Christ is preached and worshiped. "Just as it is necessary to believe in an invisible Church, evident only to the eyes of God, so likewise," he writes, "we are commanded to obey that which is called the Church among men, and to cultivate communion with it."[2] The invisible Church is in some sense "truer" than the visible. It is a sort of Platonic idea, an incorruptible exemplar of unity and holiness. The visible Church might be called an earthly replica of the invisible. What the invisible Church is, the visible strives to become. But being an external, human organization, it always falls short of what it should be. It contains within its membership sinners and hypocrites, who have no place in the *una sancta.* Even in its faith and worship, the visible Church is defective. To some extent it permits the pure Word of God to become encrusted with the traditions of men, so that the Gospel is constantly in need of rediscovery.

Reformation, in the Protestant view, is not an occasional eruption, but a continuous process in the life of the Church. *Ecclesia semper reformanda est.* At certain times, such as the later middle ages, the light of the Gospel had been more than usually obscured, so that the truth faith could hardly be found. Luther and Calvin felt that they had been called not to set up a new Church but to remove the human accretions from the ancient and ever-living Church of Christ. "The Church of Christ," wrote Calvin, "has ever lived, and will live as long as Christ is reigning at the right hand of the Father . . . but they err grievously who do not acknowledge that Church unless they see it under a form which appears to the eye, and who seek to confine it within limits in which it is by no means contained. . . . We, on the contrary, maintain that the Church cannot be recognized by any external form (nay, not by that outward pomp which they so fondly admire), but is distinguished by a very different note—namely the pure preaching of the Word of God, and the legitimate administration of the Sacraments."[3]

[2] *Institutionis christianae religionis libri quattuor* (Geneva, 1617), lib. IV, c. 1, n. 7.

[3] *Ibid.,* Praefatio ad regem Galliae.

In speaking of the "true" visible Church, it should be noted, Protestants do not usually give that term the sharply exclusive sense which it connotes for Catholic ears. They are inclined to hold that since all human authorities are fallible, no Church can be anything but relatively and provisionally true. To place implicit faith in any living *magisterium* is in their view idolatrous. The hierarchical principle is rejected by all Protestants except a minority of right-wing Anglicans who despise the very name of Protestantism.

Protestant controversialists have been particularly bitter against the "superstition," as they consider it, that an unbroken succession of bishops is either sufficient or necessary to render a Church legitimate. "This pretext of succession is futile," writes Calvin against the "Papists," "unless they have persevered in the truth of Christ and retained it for their successors."[4] True apostolicity, according to the typically Protestant position, consists in fidelity to the teaching and cult of the Apostles. "Each dissenting group," as the late Dr. Craig, of Drew Seminary, correctly observed, "believes in its spiritual continuity with Christ and the apostles, even though the line of institutional continuity is broken. When institutional continuity is deliberately broken, it is assumed to be for the sake of restoring a spiritual continuity which has been threatened by inertia and corruption."[5]

Most of the Protestant sects have an ordained clergy, and some, such as the Episcopalians, Methodists, and Scandinavian Lutherans, are governed by bishops. Whatever the form of government, however, Church authority is regarded as ministerial, not magisterial. The ministers are the ordinary teachers of the Gospel. If they err, they are subject to correction by anyone who, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, may be better informed. The Puritans and Quakers carried Protestantism to its logical conclusion by holding that even laymen, when dissatisfied with the rule of the clergy, have the right and duty to go out and found their own independent congregations.

The vitality of Protestantism has come from its constant refusal to be satisfied with things as they are, its restless striving for

[4] *Ibid.*, lib. IV, c. 2, n. 2.

[5] Craig, Clarence T. "Report of the American Theological Committee," in Flew, R. Newton, *The Nature of the Church* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1952), pp. 245-46.

greater holiness and purity of worship. In the contemporary Protestant world, this dissatisfaction is exemplified in the "crisis theology" of Karl Barth, who holds that religious experience is always in danger of petrifying into fixed forms of dogma and liturgy with the result that, as he puts it, "the grace of God's Word and Spirit becomes the routine of a religious and moral code."[6] The real Church, for Barth, is the living congregation existentially engaged in the act of worship. When religion becomes institutionalized, he maintains, we have "the phenomenon of the nominal church, or the church which is merely an ecclesiastical shell."[7]

In his primary concern with the vertical, or Godward, aspect of religion, Barth is traditionally Protestant. But recently, under the impact of changing world conditions, many Protestant thinkers are showing keen interest in the horizontal, or societal, dimension of the Church. They are convinced that sectarianism has gone too far, and that the conflicts between the various denominations are an outrageous scandal. The relationship between the Church and the churches is perhaps the major issue in contemporary Protestant theology.

The World Council of Churches, founded in 1948, is an effort to find some solution to this problem. The Council includes in its membership not only the principal Protestant sects but also the Old Catholics and even some Greek Orthodox bodies. It is not a union of Churches, but rather a common confession that disunion is no longer tolerable. Dr. Visser 't Hooft, Secretary General of the World Council of Churches, has pointed out that the Council, in its present form, falls far short of the ideal. 'If one goes back to the Bible," he writes, "and compares the fellowship which the Churches have in the World Council with the *koinonia* of the Acts and Epistles, one finds that the essential aspects of that *koinonia* are lacking today— namely the full common witness and the full sharing of the sacramental life. . . . Our inability to meet together at the Lord's Table reminds us more insistently than anything else that the unity which has been

[6] "The Church—the Living Congregation of the Living Lord Jesus Christ," in *Man's Disorder and God's Design,* The Amsterdam Assembly Series (New York: Harper & Bros., 1948), I, 70.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 71.

granted to us is only a shadow of that full unity which characterizes the Body of Christ."[8]

The general aim of the World Council, according to many of its leaders, is to make the visible organization of the Churches reflect more adequately the invisible unity of the *una sancta.* That the communion of true Christians is wider than any one sect, all Protestants would agree. The problem, however, is how to achieve a fuller mutual recognition. On this question there are two main schools of thought. The more conservative ecumenicists hold that Christianity, to be genuine, must be orthodox. The true preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the Sacraments are the marks of any legitimate Church. In accordance with this assumption, the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council has been making efforts to promote agreement on matters of doctrine and worship.

In recent years, however, a more radical approach has been gaining ground. Many Protestants are persuaded that men of good will, under the conditions of this mortal life, will never come to agree on an identical interpretation of Christ's message. But there is no need, according to these thinkers, to insist upon such a goal. In spite of their differing views on doctrine and worship, all who love Christ and wish to bear His name are fundamentally one in Him. They should recognize their fellowship in the one Body of Christ without demanding conformity to one rule of faith and order.

The ecumenical movement, then, is confronted by the problem whether dogma is more precious than unity or unity more precious than dogma. The Catholic view that all Christians should achieve dogmatic unity through submission to a single authorized magisterium is repugnant to all Protestants. Hierarchy, and especially the Roman primacy, to them imply a blasphemous substitution of human authority for the interior guidance of the Spirit. In the Catholic Church, unfortunately, they see little but the external apparatus of an authoritarian, juridical society. For our part, we cannot do better than to insist that the Church is a society of love as well as a society of law, and that our obedience to the Vicar

[8] "The Significance of the World Council of Churches," by W. A. Visser 't Hooft, in *Man's Disorder and God's Design,* I, 182.

of Christ is a means of achieving closer and more vital union with God. In the Catholic Church, and nowhere else, the religion of authority coincides with the religion of the spirit. For the authority of the Church is the power of her Spirit, and her Spirit is the Spirit of God.

AVERY R. DULLES, S.J.

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Md.

THE NECESSITY OF THE CHURCH AND THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER

In the present status of sacred theology we are badly in need of a work of integration in the study of the dogma that the Catholic Church is, by God's own institution, definitely necessary for the attainment of eternal salvation. It would seem that the Holy Office letter, the *Suprema haec sacra,* addressed on Aug. 8, 1949, to His Excellency the Most Reverend Archbishop of Boston,[1] offers us the way to a most fruitful work of theological integration. There is every reason to take advantage of that opportunity.

The work of theological integration is the procedure which the Vatican Council described as characteristic of the sacred science. According to the Council, "When reason, enlightened by faith, carefully, religiously, and soberly seeks, by God's help, some understanding of the mysteries, it achieves a most fruitful understanding both by way of analogy with what is known in a natural way, and from the connection of the mysteries among themselves and with man's last end."[2] Thus, when we compare a mystery of the faith with other divinely revealed truths, especially with those most intimately connected with the dogma we are studying, we may, if we institute and carry on that process of comparison rightly and prayerfully, arrive at an exceedingly valuable intellectual insight into that mystery.

Most intimately connected with the dogma of the necessity of the Church for the attainment of eternal salvation are the dogmas on the nature of the Church, on the meaning of salvation, on the redemptive work through which salvation is achieved, and on the status of sin which is the *terminus a quo* in the process of salvation. Likewise connected with this dogma, and most closely associated with it, are the divinely revealed teachings about the other realities which, like the Church itself, are presented to us in the divine message as factors apart from which salvation is

[1] The complete Latin text and the authorized English translation of the *Suprema haec sacra* are in *AER,* CXXVII, 4 (Oct., 1952), 307-15.

[2] *Denz.,* 1796.

not to be attained. Among these we may mention faith, charity, baptism, the Eucharist, and prayer.

The *Suprema haec sacra* lets us look at the dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation in the perspective of the necessity of faith, charity, and prayer. It is especially on this last point, the explanation of the dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation in the light of the Catholic teaching on the necessity and the efficacy of prayer, that the Holy Office letter has opened the way for a more effective explanation of this portion of ecclesiology.

The fact that a man can be saved if he is sincerely desirous of entering the true Church, even when this desire is only implicit, has long been a part of Catholic teaching about the true Kingdom of God on earth. Up until the time of the issuance of the *Suprema haec sacra,* however, this Catholic teaching had been set forth explicitly only in manuals of sacred theology and in books of Christian doctrine. The *Suprema haec sacra* was the first authoritative document of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* to bring out this teaching in an explicit form.[3] This is what has made the letter a document of primary importance.

The *Suprema haec sacra* contains these statements:

> That one may obtain eternal salvation, it is not always required that he be incorporated into the Church *actually* as a member, but it is necessary that at least he be united to her by *desire* and *longing.*
>
> However, this desire need not always be explicit, as it is in catechumens; but when a person is involved in invincible ignorance, God accepts also an implicit desire (*implicitum votum*), so called because it is included in that good disposition of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God.[4]

With reference to this *votum* or *desiderium* the Holy Office letter adds this essentially important teaching.

> But it must not be thought that any kind of desire of entering the Church suffices that one may be saved. It is necessary that the desire by which one is related to the Church be animated by perfect charity. Nor can an implicit desire produce its effect unless a person has supernatural faith. . . .[5]

---

[3] Cf. Fenton, "The Holy Office Letter on the Necessity of the Catholic Church," *AER,* CXXVII, 6 (Dec., 1952), 450-61.

[4] *AER,* CXXVII, 4 (Oct., 1952), 313. [5] *Ibid.,* 314.

Furthermore, the *Suprema haec sacra* calls our attention to the fact that there are other realities of the supernatural order which can be called truly necessary for salvation with the necessity of means and which, like the Church, can, under certain circumstances, produce their effect when a man who cannot actually use them desires sincerely to employ them. These realities are necessary means for salvation because God has so instituted them, and not because they are requisite for salvation with intrinsic necessity. Here is the teaching of the Holy Office letter on this subject.

> In His infinite mercy God has willed that the effects, necessary for one to be saved, of those helps to salvation which are directed toward man's final end, not by intrinsic necessity, but only by divine institution, can also be obtained in certain circumstances when those helps are used only in *desire* and *longing*. This we see clearly stated in the Sacred Council of Trent, both in reference to the Sacrament of Regeneration and in reference to the Sacrament of Penance.[6]

The "certain circumstances" of which the *Suprema haec sacra* speaks are present when an individual is really unable to be baptized or to go to confession before his death. A man placed in such a position can attain to the Beatific Vision through the sincere desire or will to receive these sacraments. This is possible even when that desire or will is implicit rather than explicit, that is, when the individual does not possess a clear understanding of the revealed doctrine about the Sacraments of Baptism and of Penance, and only desires them in an obscure or confused manner as things which God wills that he should receive. When a man who has true supernatural faith and genuine charity desires, in his love of friendship for God, to do all God demands of him for his eternal salvation, he implicitly desires baptism, entrance into the Church, or the Sacrament of Penance, even though he should have no exact knowledge of the Church or of the sacraments. If he should die before he can actually be baptized, actually be received into the Church, or actually go to confession, his desire is realized by God's mercy, and he will be saved, through the Church and through the sacraments.

[6] *Ibid.*, 313.

Likewise, and even more obviously, a catechumen who desires to be baptized, a non-Catholic who desires to be received into the Catholic Church, or one of the faithful who has been guilty of mortal sin committed after Baptism and unforgiven by sacramental absolution can be saved if, with genuine faith and charity, they die before they have the opportunity to avail themselves of these divine gifts. In all of these cases the *votum* or the *desiderium* of the individual is accomplished by God's own mercy. All of these individuals can be saved, not independently of the Church and of the sacraments, but precisely in and through the Church and the sacraments, possessed in a sincere will or desire.

Now it is precisely at this point that the *Suprema haec sacra* has opened the way to an important advance in the field of scholastic theology. In stressing the fact that there are certain gifts which God has instituted as necessary for salvation with the necessity of means, gifts which, under certain circumstances, can be effective for a man who sincerely desires them but is unable actually to obtain them, the Holy Office letter has invited theologians to bring their thesis on the necessity of the Church for salvation into contact with that portion of sacred doctrine that deals with the efficacy of prayer.

The theology of prayer tells us of the way in which a petition made to God, an expression of man's sincere desire, can, in the merciful designs of God's providence, actually be the cause of the benefit man begs from God. And, in all the extent of sacred theology, there is no mention of any agency other than prayer which can make a man's desire or intention unfailingly efficacious in obtaining from God a benefit which He alone can grant.

The *Suprema haec sacra* reiterates the Catholic dogma that there is no salvation whatsoever outside of the true Church of Jesus Christ.[7] According to this teaching, then, a man who dies "outside of" the Catholic Church simply will not obtain the Beatific Vision. At the same time, however, this letter assures us that salvation is possible, under certain circumstances, for a man who has a *votum* or a *desiderium* of entering the Church and remaining within it. It insists furthermore that this can be true even when the *votum* or *desiderium* is merely implicit.

[7] *Ibid.*, 312.

Hence it follows that an act of the human will which is a desire to be within the Catholic Church can, when certain conditions have been fulfilled, be infallibly efficacious. A non-Catholic who wishes to be within the Church is granted his wish even though he dies before he has the opportunity to be baptized or to be received publicly into the Church. If he is saved, he is actually one who has passed from this life "within" the true Church of God. To use the terminology of the Council of Florence, he is one of those who have been "incorporated (*aggregati*)" into the true Church before their death.[8] His own desire or intention must be considered as in a certain way a true efficient cause of this incorporation or aggregation into the Catholic Church.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the object of the *votum* or *desiderium* of which the Holy Office letter speaks is "to be within the Church in such a way as to obtain eternal salvation." This is precisely the benefit obtained by the person who desires or wills it, even though he passes from this life before he has had the opportunity to receive the Sacrament of Baptism or canonical reconciliation with the Church. It is obviously a benefit quite beyond the limits of man's natural competence. As a reality of the intrinsically supernatural order, it is a favor which only God can grant.

The Church is the assembly of those called, of the *vocati.* According to St. Robert Bellarmine: "The people of God is designated as the assembly of the called (*coetus vocatorum*) because no one joins this people by his own efforts (*per se*) or of his own accord, but all who come do so by reason of a previous invitation from God."[9] To be "within" the Church is thus a gift from God, something which a man obtains only with the help of divine grace. The *votum* or the *desiderium* of entering the Church and of remaining within it is an act of the will moved by God's grace. And, if that *votum* or *desiderium* is in any way efficacious of itself, it is only because it is expressed to God in an act of prayer, the *petitio decentium a Deo.*[10]

[8] *Denz.*, 714. [9] *De ecclesia militante*, cap. 1.

[10] The classical theological definition of prayer is that formulated by St. John Damascene in his work *On the Orthodox Faith*, Book III, cap. 24: "Prayer is the raising of the mind to God, or the petition of fitting things from God." Cf. Fenton, *The Theology of Prayer* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1939), pp. 1-15.

This aspect of the teaching on the necessity of the Church for salvation is brought out quite clearly in what has always been regarded as the classical patristic text on the subject. The traditional Catholic explanation of the truth that a man who sincerely desires to be baptized and to enter the true Church can be saved even though he dies before he has the opportunity of receiving the Sacrament of Baptism has employed the terms used by St. Ambrose in his sermon *De obitu Valentiniani.* Here we find the notions of *votum* and *desiderium* used along with the idea of *petitio.* The following is a translation of the pertinent paragraph in St. Ambrose's sermon.

> But I hear that you are sorrowing because he [the Emperor Valentinian II] did not receive the rites of Baptism. Tell me, what else is there in us but will, but petition? Now quite recently it was his intention to be baptized before he came into Italy. He let it be known that he wanted me to baptize him very soon, and it was for that reason above all others that he decided to have me summoned. Does he not, then, have the grace he desired? Does he not have what he prayed for? Surely, because he prayed for it, he has received it. Hence it is that "the soul of the just man will be at rest, whatever kind of death may overtake him."[11]

What St. Ambrose taught in this passage was and is the traditional doctrine of the Catholic Church. Hence it is most interesting and enlightening to learn that here he equates the desire of baptism, the desire to be within the true Church, and prayer for this favor. The key to all of his teaching on this point is his assertion that "Surely, *because he prayed for it,* he has received it." The emperor's intention to receive baptism and to dwell within the true Church was effective precisely because that intention or desire had been expressed to God in the form of prayer.

There is absolutely no reason to suppose that the teaching contained in the *Suprema haec sacra* is to be interpreted otherwise. Now, as in the time of St. Ambrose, a man's will or desire to enter the Church can be effective, even when he dies before he is able to be received into this society sacramentally or canonically, when this will or desire is presented to God in the petition of true Christian prayer. This remains true when the desire and

[11] St. Ambrose, *De obitu Valentiniani,* 51.

the prayer to enter the true Church is implicit within the intention and the petition for the glory of God and for the attainment of our own eternal salvation.

The *Suprema haec sacra* has reminded us that the desire or will to enter the Church can suffice for the attainment of salvation only when it is enlightened by supernatural faith and motivated by perfect charity. This teaching also implies that such an effective will or desire must be something presented to God in prayer, the petition of fitting things from God. It seems quite obvious that a man who is guided by the light of divine faith and animated by the love of charity for God will realize that his own natural powers will not suffice to bring him into the supernatural kingdom of Christ in such a way as to obtain eternal salvation. Such an individual would be quite aware of the fact that eternal salvation and all of the supernatural aids requisite for its attainment are favors which he can obtain only from God, and, ultimately, only as favors which he must beg or petition from God. He will, as a matter of fact, ask God for such favors in the act of prayer.

Thus, by the very nature of the case, the will or desire to enter the true Church, spoken of in the *Suprema haec sacra,* tends to be and actually becomes a petition made to God, an act of Christian prayer. Any man who, as a result of his will or desire to enter the Church, is brought "within" this society in such a way as to attain salvation in it receives this favor, as St. Ambrose has said, "because he prayed for it."

There are two highly important lessons to be drawn from this connection between the *votum* or the *desiderium* of entering the true Church and the petition of Christian prayer. The first is the fact that the will or desire achieves its effectiveness precisely from the unfailing efficacy and the real necessity of prayer itself. The second is the truth that the characteristics by which prayer itself becomes unfailingly efficacious must belong to the will or desire of entering the Church which can, under certain circumstances, suffice for the attainment of eternal salvation. First we should consider the Catholic doctrine on the efficacy and the necessity of prayer.

The efficacy of prayer is something which Our Lord Himself has guaranteed. This teaching is summed up in Our Lord's declaration: "Therefore I say unto you, all things whatsoever you

ask when ye pray, believe that you shall receive: and they shall come unto you."[12] There is also this teaching from Our Divine Master:

> Ask, and it shall be given you: seek, and you shall find: knock, and it shall be opened to you.
>
> For every one that asketh, receiveth: and he that seeketh, findeth: and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened.[13]

Finally, there is this unqualified assertion made by Our Blessed Lord. "And all things whatsoever you shall ask in prayer believing, you shall receive."[14] The things which can be obtained with infallible efficacy through the act of prayer are objects which it is fitting to ask of God. They are realities of which we are aware and which we recognize as desirable in the light of true Christian faith. It is quite clear that inclusion within the true Church of God, being within His supernatural kingdom in the way that leads to eternal salvation, is one of these objects.

Another aspect of the teaching on the necessity of the Catholic Church for the attainment of eternal salvation is brought out by considering this doctrine in the light of the Catholic teaching about the necessity of prayer itself Our Lord Himself told us that "We ought always to pray, and not to faint."[15] St. Paul insisted that we should "pray without ceasing."[16] The Second Council of Orange brought out this scriptural teaching very clearly in its statement that "Even people who are baptized and in the state of grace must always implore God's help so that they may come to a good end or so that they may persevere in good conduct."[17] Obviously, according to the teaching of the Council and according to Catholic doctrine itself, prayer is no less necessary for people who are not baptized and for those who have not as yet entered into the true Church. In other words, it is Catholic doctrine that no adult can obtain the Beatific Vision apart from prayer, the *petitio decentium a Deo.* For one who has reached the use of reason, prayer is necessary for the attainment of eternal salvation.

It is important to note that this prayer, apart from which the attainment of man's eternal salvation is impossible, is precisely an act in which a creature, moved by God's grace, begs Him for

[12] *Mark,* 11:24. [13] *Matth.,* 7:7-8. [14] *Matth.,* 21:22.
[15] *Luke,* 18:1. [16] *I Thes.,* 5:17. [17] *Denz.,* 183.

the gift of salvation and for those things which are or which he believes to be necessary for or conducive to the possession of man's ultimate end. The model or the chart of all true prayer to God is to be found in the *Pater noster,* the formula Our Lord taught to His disciples after they had asked Him how they were to pray.[18] When this petition is made properly—in other words, when the petition is truly an act of prayer—it is unfailingly effective for the attainment of salvation itself and the factors which are, either by intrinsic necessity or by divine institution, requisite for the possession of the Beatific Vision. Entrance into the true Church before the moment of death, the condition in which a man is "within" rather than "outside of" the true Church at the instant he passes from this life, is something which is by divine institution requisite for the attainment of eternal salvation. Hence it is something with reference to which the true act of prayer is unfailingly effective.

Furthermore, it must be distinctly understood that an act would not be a prayer in the true and proper sense of the term if it should exclude a petition that the one praying might dwell within the supernatural kingdom of God. If such an intention or desire were not included at least implicitly in a petition made to God, that act would not be a petition of fitting things from God, and it would certainly not be in accord with the model Our Lord gave to us in the *Pater noster.* Thus, if a man who is not a member of the Catholic Church actually prays to God, he thereby begs God for the grace to enter the true Church of Jesus Christ in such a way as thereby to achieve eternal salvation. The prayer of a member of the Church necessarily includes, at least implicitly, the petition that God may give us the grace of keeping us within the company of Our Lord's disciples.

So it is that, in the light of the theological truths which are seen most clearly when we bring together and compare the dogma of the necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation and the Catholic doctrine about the act of prayer, it becomes apparent that a man who achieves eternal salvation by a *votum* or a *desiderium* of entering the true Church is actually one who has prayed for this inclusion in the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.

[18] Cf. *Luke,* 11:1-2; *Matth.,* 6:9.

He must pray if he is to be saved. This petition is necessarily a part of his prayer. And his prayer, his petition of fitting things from God, is, by God's own guarantee, infallibly efficacious.

It would likewise appear that this comparison between the dogma of the necessity of the Church for the attainment of eternal salvation and the Catholic doctrine on prayer can be the source of a genuine and important contribution to sacred theology by reason of the light that it throws on the nature of the *votum* or *desiderium* spoken of in the *Suprema haec sacra.* The theology of prayer instructs us on the subject of the conditions which must be verified in a petition made to God in order that this petition may be unfailingly effective for the attainment of its objective—in other words, in order that this petition may be most truly and properly a prayer in the Christian sense of the term. Prayer is infallibly efficacious (1) when it is offered for oneself; (2) when it is offered for the gift of salvation or for something requisite for the attainment of salvation; (3) when it is offered properly or piously; and (4) when it is persevering.[19] If the intention or desire of entering the Church and of remaining within it in such a way as to obtain salvation is to be effective, this intention must be contained in a petition to God and must be endowed with the above properties.

Obviously when we are dealing with the *votum ecclesiam ingrediendi* the first two of these conditions are automatically fulfilled. The man who desires and prays to be within the Church is manifestly praying for himself and the Church is certainly necessary for the attainment of salvation. In order that this intention or desire be infallibly effective, however, the prayer into which it is incorporated must also conform to the other two conditions.

The prayer and the desire expressed in the prayer must be formulated piously or properly. This means that the intention be enlightened by divine faith, that it be the expression of Christian hope, that it be motivated by the love of God, and that it be humble.[20] The *Suprema haec sacra* has explicitly called our attention to the fact that a desire to enter the Church can bring men to salvation only when it is animated by perfect charity and

[19] Cf. *The Theology of Prayer,* pp. 209-15. [20] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 212 f.

when it is based on supernatural faith. As St. Thomas' *Compendium theologiae* shows us so clearly, prayer itself is the expression of Christian hope.[21] The will to enter the Church in such a way as to obtain eternal salvation is a difficult good which can only be procured through the aid and grace of God. It is thus something within the object of hope, and something for which men should and must pray. The humility which is requisite for successful prayer is that of which St. Peter wrote: "And do you all insinuate humility one to another: for God resisteth the proud, but to the humble he giveth grace. Be you humbled, therefore, under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in the time of visitation."[22] Where that humility is absent, a man's conduct cannot be pleasing to God.

The perseverance which must be present if prayer is to be infallibly effective in attaining its object is the characteristic that distinugishes a genuine intention from a mere velleity. The Holy Office letter to the Most Reverend Archbishop of Boston says that, under certain circumstances, a *votum* or *desiderium* of entering the true Church will suffice for salvation when it is impossible actually to become a member of the society of Our Lord's disciples. The important point is that this act must be a genuine desire or intention rather than what is called a velleity.[23]

Now velleity is an act of the will which we would express in words by the statement that we would like to do something or other. On the other hand, an intention is an act of the will which we manifest when we state that we really mean to do it and are setting out to do it. An intention is automatically and by its very nature effective, not immediately of the object with which it is concerned, but of a complex of attitudes and tendencies with reference to that object. A genuine intention automatically cancels out any project for another act which is seen as incompatible with the object of the intention. The velleity very definitely does not.

Thus, if I really intend to say Mass in a certain church tomorrow morning, I automatically renounce any other project which I recognize as inconsistent or incompatible with the saying of Mass at that time and in that place. Thus, if I have this

[21] Cf. St. Thomas, *Compendium theologiae*, II, cap. 2.
[22] *I Pet.*, 5: 5-6. [23] Cf. *The Theology of Prayer*, pp. 23 f.

intention, I necessarily put away any project of taking a trip which would make it impossible for me to say this Mass. And, on the other hand, if I go about making preparations for a trip of this kind, and if I actually set out on the trip, it is an indication that I had a velleity rather than an intention of saying the Mass in the church I had originally planned.

Now it is obvious that the *votum* or the *desiderium* of entering and remaining within the true Church must be something in the line of an intention if it is to be effective in the way of eternal salvation. The very use of the terms *"votum"* and *"desiderium"* would have sufficed to make this clear. But further light is cast on this truth by the fact that the *votum* or *desiderium* is something meant to be expressed in an act of prayer, the petition of fitting things from God.

The perseverance and the sincerity of an intention that goes into a *petitio decentium a Deo* is unquestionable. Prayer is an act of the virtue of religion, that virtue which disposes us to give to God the tribute of acknowledgment and praise which is His due. The humility of prayer is one way of paying that debt. When we ask God for the favors we need from Him we are thereby acknowledging His supreme dominion and excellence.

If, however, a man were to presume to beg God for something which he did not really desire or will to have, the act would objectively constitute an act of mockery of God, rather than an act in which the tribute of reverence is paid to Him. Such an act obviously would not be a prayer at all in the proper sense of the term. It would certainly not be effective of its object in any way. On the contrary, a *votum* or *desiderium* which is effective of its object in the context of Christian prayer is definitely in the class of an intention.

Finally, there is, in this comparison between the doctrines on prayer and on the necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation, a tremendously important insight into the way in which the individual who desires and prays with the true prayer of Christian charity to be within the Church is actually contained in this society. The first description we have of the Catholic Church, gathered together after Our Lord's ascension into heaven, is contained in this passage from the *Acts of the Apostles.*

Then they returned to Jerusalem from the mount that is called Olivet, which is nigh Jerusalem, within a sabbath day's journey.

And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode Peter and John, James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James of Alpheus and Simon Zelotes and Jude the brother of James.

All these were persevering with one mind in prayer, with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.[24]

Thus from the very outset the Church appears as a society united in prayer. The Eucharistic Sacrifice, which is properly the act of the Mystical Body, the central work to which the Church is devoted, is integrated into the process of prayer. Essentially that petition is and always must be modelled upon the great exemplar, the formula Our Lord taught His disciples when they asked Him to teach them how to pray, the *Pater noster.*

Whatever new members were joined to the original company of the disciples entered, by that very fact, into this basic work of prayer. This is made abundantly clear by the report in the *Acts of the Apostles* on the converts who came into the Church on the first Christian Pentecost.

And with many other words did he testify and exhort them, saying: Save yourselves from this perverse generation.

They therefore that received his word were baptized: and there were added in that day about three thousands souls.

And they were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles and in the communication of the breaking of bread and in prayers.[25]

The man who, enlightened by divine faith and motivated by perfect charity, prays to obtain from God the grace of entering the Church in such a way as to attain eternal salvation is actually taking part in this basic activity of the Church itself. All true prayer is modelled on the exemplar of the *Pater noster.* It seeks the glory of God in our own eternal salvation, and begs also for those benefits which are necessary for or at least conducive to the attainment of this ultimate purpose. When, moved by God's grace, a man who is not a member of the Church truly prays that God's will be done, he thereby takes part in a work of

[24] *Acts,* 1:13-14. [25] *Acts,* 2:40-42.

religion which is the function of the society of Our Lord's disciples. To that extent he is brought "within" the Church.

It is only through the possession of the sacramental character of Baptism that a man is rendered capable of taking part in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and of receiving the Blessed Sacrament. The desire or will to enter the Church, even when informed by perfect charity, does not give that capacity, and does not confer actual membership in the Church. But the union by and in the act of Christian prayer can transfer a person from the condition of being "outside the Church," to a dwelling "within" it in such a way as to obtain, in it, the gift of eternal life.

What has been said here about the place of prayer in the teaching on the necessity of the Church for the attainment of eternal salvation is, after all, one of the lessons brought out by Pope Pius IX in one of his explanations of this dogma. In his allocution *Singulari quadam,* delivered to the members of the hierarchy gathered in Rome for the pronouncement of the dogma of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception, the great Sovereign Pontiff ended his statements about the possibility of salvation for those who are not members of the true Church with the reminder that "the hand of the Lord is not shortened and the gifts of heavenly grace will never be lacking to those who sincerely wish *and pray* to be comforted in this light."[26]

In issuing this reminder, Pope Pius IX took cognizance of the fact that the will, desire, or intention of entering the true Church so as to attain salvation within it is, in the order of God's own providence, meant to be effective by having this act of the will expressed in the process of Christian prayer.

Joseph Clifford Fenton

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[26] *Denz.,* 1648.

Answers to Questions

EFFECTS OF SINFUL INTENTION ON DISPENSATION

Question: A couple enter a mixed marriage with the intention of practicing contraception, at least for a few years. Does this sinful intention invalidate the dispensation granted for the impediment of mixed religion or disparity of cult?

Answer: The dispensation for mixed religion or disparity of cult is granted on condition that there are grave and just reasons, that the non-Catholic promises that he will keep the danger of perversion away from the Catholic and both agree that all the children will be baptized and brought up in the Catholic religion, and that there is moral certitude that these promises will be fulfilled (Can. 1061, 1071). The promises or guarantees required as a condition for the dispensation do not include the promise or intention of not practicing contraception; hence, the dispensation is not invalidated by the fact that the couple intend to commit this sin. It should be noted, however, that the intention of practicing contraception might substantially vitiate the marital consent (Can. 1086, §2), and thus invalidate the marriage. This would take place when the intention was present on the part of either one (or both) not to give to the other the unqualified *right* to proper conjugal intercourse—but not if the party (or parties) merely intended not to *fulfill properly* the conjugal obligation. The Church presumes that when the intention of not having children is absolute, it excludes the intention of giving the unqualified right and of accepting the obligation; whereas, when the intention of not having children (and practicing contraception) is intended for a few years only, the presumption is that it includes only the purpose of not *fulfilling* the obligation and of *abusing* the right. In the words of Bouscaren: "An agreement not to have children for a certain time will be presumed to exclude only the fulfilment of the obligation, and hence will leave the matrimonial consent valid, until the contrary is proved" (*Canon Law Digest,* II, 310).

PRESUMED FATHER AS GODPARENT

Question: In my parish in the West Indies many children are born out of wedlock. In almost every case the presumed father acknowledges his paternity; but he is still only presumed to be the father. May he act as godfather at the child's baptism? This can be to the child's advantage, inasmuch as the relationship of godfather is clearer and closer and carries more responsibilities than that of a presumed father.

Answer: According to Canon Law (Can. 777, §2), if a man demands of the parish priest, in writing or before two witnesses, that his name be inscribed in the baptismal register as the father of a child born out of wedlock, his name is to be recorded. When this is done, the Church regards him as the father, not merely the presumed father, and he could not act as the child's godparent. Even if such an acknowledgment has not been made, the man could not validly serve as the child's godfather if he himself is sure that he is the child's father, though others may have only a presumption that the child was begotten by him (Can. 765, §3). However, if the mother has been promiscuous, and one of the men who has had relations with her strongly suspects (but is not sure) that he is the child's father, it would seem that he could act as godfather if he received a dispensation for this function from the Ordinary, by virtue of Canon 15, which prescribed that in a doubt of fact, when there is question of an invalidating law, the local Ordinary can dispense in those laws from which the Roman Pontiff is wont to dispense. There may be some difficulty in this final clause, but I believe we can safely assert that the Sovereign Pontiff would dispense in the case presented, in view of the arguments in favor of such a dispensation.

THE BLESSING AFTER CHILDBIRTH

Question: May a woman receive the blessing after childbirth (churching) in the hospital chapel before the child has been baptized?

Answer: The first problem concerns the right of the woman to receive this blessing in the hospital chapel, presumably from a priest who is not her pastor. Although there was some discussion

on this matter in past among the canonists, whether or not this blessing is to be regarded as a function proper to the pastor, it is now certain that the churching of a woman is not so reserved. In the words of Fr. Bernard Kelly, J.C.D., in his dissertation *The Functions Reserved to Pastors* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947), p. 48: "The blessing of women after childbirth is not listed among the reserved functions; no longer can there be any doubt concerning the non-parochial character of this function." The other problem arises from the fact that the child has not yet been baptized. However, this fact does not prohibit the conferring of the blessing on the mother. The Congregation of Sacred Rites has decreed (S.R.C. n. 3904) that the blessing shall not be refused to a mother, even though the child has died without Baptism; hence, *a fortiori,* it should not be refused to a mother whose child is to be baptized in the near future.

CONFIRMATION BY A SUBSTITUTE CHAPLAIN

Question: Can a priest who is taking the place of a chaplain in a maternity hospital confer the sacrament of Confirmation on newborn infants in danger of death, as the regular chaplain is entitled to do? I am referring to a priest who has not been officially appointed by the Bishop to substitute for the regular chaplain.

Answer: The priest who takes the regular chaplain's place in the manner described could not validly administer Confirmation to infants in danger of death, even though the regular chaplain enjoys this faculty. The case is somewhat similar to that of a priest who would take a pastor's place temporarily without any appointment from the Bishop. Such a priest could not administer Confirmation even in those instances in which the pastor could confer this sacrament by virtue of the concession granted to pastors by the Holy See on September 14, 1946.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

EUCHARISTIC FAST DISPENSATION

Question: May a priest grant permission permanently to take liquids before Holy Communion to a person who always finds it extremely difficult to fast because of heavy work; because of a sick headache which would otherwise ensue?

Answer: "The faithful in like manner, even though not sick, who because of grave inconvenience—that is, because of exhausting labor, because they can draw near the Holy Banquet only at a rather late hour . . . cannot approach the Eucharistic table completely fasting, may with the prudent advice of a confessor, as long as the need last, take something by way of drink, exclusive of alcoholic beverages, They must abstain from such drink at least for the space of one hour before they are nourished by the Bread of Angels." Thus reads the law which answers the difficulty proposed by our inquirer. The dispensation can be granted as long as the *incommodum* exists. When that situation clears itself or no longer exists the permission automatically ceases.

MASS ON A FERIAL DAY IN LENT

Question: During Lent very often we have a double feast occur with the feria. As for example on March 9 we had the feast of St. Francis of Rome. Am I free to choose any of the two Masses for the High Mass that we have every day in our church? Am I free to say either Mass or must the High Mass specifically be one or the other?

Answer: We have our choice of Masses on these days. Some prefer the ferial Mass while others prefer to say the Mass of the Saint whose feast is being observed.

HOLY THURSDAY DIFFICULTY

Question: Each year I worry about the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament on Holy Thursday. We have a very small church and sacristy. We are able to have a repository but the reservation of the ciborium gives me great concern. What is the law in this regard?

Answer: The Sacred Congregation of Sacraments in 1929 issued the following decree concerning the reservation of Sacred Hosts during the last days of Holy Week:

"The following is to be observed concerning the keeping of the Sacred Hosts: According to the spirit of the Rubrics, the pyx with the particles should be reserved outside the church, namely near the sacristy in a convenient and suitable place, where the Blessed Sacrament should be kept with due reverence, not for the adoration of the faithful, but only for the Communion of the sick. Such a fit place is a chapel or shrine near the church, or the sacristy itself, or a small room of the sacristy provided it is safe and respectable, or also a respectable place in the parish house which is not used for domestic or profane purposes. There a tabernacle should be placed, which is to be locked; a lamp should be kept burning before it, and the reposition should be made on Holy Thursday.

"Where there is no fit place to keep the ciborium with the Sacred Hosts, it should be kept in the Sepulcher (the Altar of the Repository), from the Mass on Holy Thursday to the Mass of the Presanctified, being placed in back of the chalice that contains the large Host. From the end of the Mass of the Presanctified to the Mass of Holy Saturday, it should be reserved in some remote and secluded chapel of the church, and there a lamp should remain burning. If there is no other fitting place in the church than the shrine of the Sepulcher, the pyx should remain in the Sepulcher until Holy Saturday. A lamp should be lighted before the Sepulcher, all other lights being extinguished and those which were there for ornament being taken away."

BENEDICTION AFTER HOLY MASS

Question: When giving Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament after the children's Mass on Sunday, is it permissible to remove only the maniple and retain the chasuble?

Answer: The chasuble is a vestment proper to the celebration of Holy Mass. From the decree of the Sacred Congregation (no. 3697) we can readily see that it is not the proper dress for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. The Sacred Congregation states the following: "If there is a question of exposition or reposition

of the Blessed Sacrament, it suffices that the priest he vested in surplice and stole only; never with alb, cincture and stole only. But in Processions and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament with Ostensorium the celebrant must put on cope and humeral veil."

We are instructed to have the celebrant after a Solemn Mass wear the cope if Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament follows his Mass. *A fortiori,* it seems, the same regulation should hold after a Low Mass.

FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION PROCESSION

Question: Is it proper or incorrect for the celebrant of the procession at Forty Hours' Devotion to join in the singing of the traditional Eucharistic hymns?

Answer: In Wapelhorst we read the following regulation: "Per viam processionis [Celebrans] semper aliquos psalmos vel hymnos submissa voce recitabit, respondentibus Diaconis assistentibus."

MASS STIPEND OBLIGATION

Question: At the beginning of each month, I obtain stipends for Masses to be said. Without waiting for the Masses to be said, I use the stipend money to pay bills. However, in my Mass book, I note the number of Masses for which I have accepted stipends and, as I say the Mass, I make the proper notation in the book. Am I right or wrong in spending this money before the Masses have been celebrated? Must I say the Masses before spending the money?

Answer: Canon Law states that a priest may not accept more stipends than he can satisfy within a year. We find nothing about a priest spending the stipend money before the obligation of celebrating the Masses has been fulfilled. However, care must be exercised by a priest not to allow this amount of money to grow excessively. Should sickness or death suddenly overtake the priest thus obligated, the Masses not already said would have to be taken care of by another priest. And because of the carelessness of one priest, a confrere, perhaps, would be required to perform an act of charity to fulfill a previous obligation.

ALTAR STONE

Question: Are there any specific dimensions given for the size of the altar stone? We are building a new altar and want to do the correct thing.

Answer: The Code of Canon Law (Can. 1198) states that the altar stone must be at least large enough to contain the sacred host and the greater part of the base of the chalice. Collins holds that most authors feel that the altar stone should be large enough to hold, besides the Sacred Host and the chalice, the ciborium that is to be consecrated for the distribution of Holy Communion. He adds that "portable altars used in churches are about twelve inches or fourteen inches square."

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC COLLEGE IN THE WORLD TODAY. By Edward A. Fitzpatrick. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1954. Pp. xii + 269, with index. $6.00.

Dr. Fitzpatrick, formerly of Marquette University and for a long time president of Mount Mary College in Milwaukee, has given his life generously to educational work, and is one of our more distinguished spokesmen on "education." In spite of being a busy administrator, he has written many volumes. The most attractive and (we believe) the most deserving is *How to Educate Human Beings* (Bruce, 1950), a mature and remarkably simple and human piece of work. In general, he has rather been suggestive than profound or scholarly. For instance, he has said over and over that the practical, including the life of the will, has a place in education, and that we need to combine theory and practice. This idea makes a lot of sense, and has not been at all fully explored by Dr. Fitzpatrick or perhaps by anyone. Christians claim that the great good and end is a contemplative one. But at the same time Christianity is a way of life. Also, we Americans have from the first been given to action, and it is no surprise that John Dewey went almost exclusively for the active and the practical. And now with homes deficient in moral training, the question, all circumstances considered, must arise whether the end should be this or that—theoretic, or practical, primarily this or primarily that.

The author has raised that question more persistently than any other American Catholic. The present volume encounters it again, and it becomes evident that he is strong for the actionist side. The volume itself is made up largely of some of the talks that this man of action gave over a span of twenty years. In fact, twelve talks delivered at his own well-loved Mount Mary's are included. It is naturally difficult in this way to carry forward anything like a single consecutive argument in which the reader can see beginning, development, and end. There is sure to be overlapping, backtracking, and repetition. Good and even excellent things are said, but there is the question of whether any one thing gets the "trenchant analysis" mentioned in the publisher's blurb.

Yet the author has much success by the use of two devices. First, he breaks the whole down under such headings as a "theology of education," "liturgy and the theology of education," the Christian teacher, and "knowledge, will, and love." Secondly, he begins each

of these six main parts with a synthesizing page or two. In this way he sums up what he has to say in the succeeding pages, and gives direction to it. These pages of synthesis and summary are the freshest pages in the volume, and the author was surely inspired when he thus put together matters that of their nature are so diverse and that, left to themselves, would give such a scattered effect.

Dr. Fitzpatrick carries along with him and often repeats some common assumptions of American Catholic educators. One of these is that if we educate the individual "for self-mastery, self-direction, self-control," "the essence of Catholic education," then "a social order will emerge from this kind of individual believing and acting." It is as simple as that. Dr. Fitzpatrick is at his best in his positive and negative handling of matters from contemporary American educational associations. He knows these matters, and knows their relevance.

LEO R. WARD, C.S.C.

THE BISHOP FINDS A WAY. By Michael Cunningham. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Young, 1955. Pp. 213. $3.00.

This is a first novel by a Canadian born but American reared convert, whose chief interest is sculpture but who in his first literary effort has produced a very readable story. True, Bishop Blunt is unlike any member of the hierarchy the reviewer has yet met and no prelate would be flattered by identification with the central character of the book. However, the other clerical characters are well done, true to life after a fashion, although they present further evidence that the only one who can write intelligently about a priest is another priest.

There is a subtle humor underlying the book, a humor to which alas! Bishop Blunt is alien. The story of Father Rockett and his effort to effect a bit of social justice in a brewery commands more interest than the central plot—the conversion of the Bishop to a work of art effected by a zealous pastor and an itinerant artist. The conversion is not complete. The Bishop merely becomes "proud that he is no longer proud." "If he could smile," writes author Cunningham, "then the Bishop would now be doing so. Rather it seemed that his hard features had softened ever so slightly."

This book will be discussed in many rectories. The author holds promise of producing more light fiction. One hopes that he will not restrict a sense of humor to the lower echelon of the clergy. In an effort to give a happier ending to the book, Mr. Cunningham makes a number of clerical transfers. The ending would be a bit happier if the

Bishop were transferred to the Kurile islands or some place in even closer proximity to the North Pole with his spineless chancellor to drive his dogsled. However, author Cunningham tells a good story and if he uses his talent to awaken priests to liturgical art, he has a special mission.

MAURICE S. SHEEHY

SUMMA DE SACRAMENTIS ET ANIMAE CONSILIIS. By Pierre le Chantre. Iiere Partie. Ed. by J.-A. Dugauquier. Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia, 4. (Louvain: Editions Nauwelaerts, 1954). Pp. 296 with indexes.

Pierre Le Chantre was one of Europe's great teachers at the dawn of Europe's great age. At the very end of the twelfth century this versatile man was theologian, exegete, canonist, and casuist all in one; and in addition a preacher of note, and an ecclesiastic whose reputation and ability earned him high honor. In him the best elements of his age are typified: deep devotion to the Church, wide erudition, true intellectual curiosity, and sensitive awareness of the problems of his fellow men. That the works of this attractive and gifted man have remained for the most part unedited is a neglect due prehaps to the fact that he was so soon overshadowed by men of far greater genius.

The first part of Pierre's greatest work, *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis,* M. Dugauquier's careful work now makes available. The entire *Summa* in three volumes plus an appendix—*Quaestiones scholares e schola Petri Cantoris*—will soon appear. The work is a critical edition, based on the seven manuscripts (and one other fragmentary manuscript); but based on them in the sense that the most authoritative manuscript, that of Troyes, forms the basis of this edition but is corrected by the others. Variant readings, omissions, additions, and so forth are noted throughout. The original text is preserved most faithfully, the editor adding only certain chapter headings. Even the notes are kept to a minimum, save those immediately concerned with the text itself.

In a lengthy introduction to the work as a whole M. Dugauquier gives a detailed account of the content of the various manuscripts, their special characteristics and the differences among them. The present volume contains in addition the text of the *Summa* on Baptism, Confirmation, Extreme Unction and the Eucharist.

As an indication of the state of theology just prior to the gigantic synthesis worked out by St. Thomas this *Summa* is fascinating. It